

*Southeast Oregon Resource Advisory Council  
 April 14, 2010- Burns, OR  
 Meeting Minutes*

**Business Meeting RAC Attendees:** Dick Leever, Mona Drake, Bill Renwick, Larry Hammond, Kevin Peterman, James Bishop, Craig Foster, Diane Pinney, Mike King, Wannie Mackenzie, Chad Boyd

**RAC members not present:** Richard Johnston, Kenneth Kestner, James Walls

**Quorum:** YES

**RAC Federal Official Attendees:** Carol Benkosky, Don Gonzalez, Teresa Raaf, Kenny McDaniel, Erika Hupp

**Visitors:** Dan Haak, Tim Barnes, Jake Kerby, Bill Pieratt, Jeff Rose

**Designated Federal Official:** Don Gonzalez

**RAC Chair:** Bill Renwick

**Notetaker:** Pam Robbins

**Facilitator:** Mark Wilkening

~~~~~

**Meeting Called to Order 8:12 a.m.**

**Member Introductions**

**Chair Elections**

Chair – Bill Renwick nominated by Larry Hammond; nomination seconded by Diane Pinney  
 Re-elected unanimously

Vice-Chair – Larry Hammond nominated Diane Pinney, nomination seconded by Mona Drake  
 Re-elected unanimously

**2010 AWP**

Topics on the table:

|                                                                  |                            |                                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Wild Horse & Burro                                               | Energy                     | Sage grouse/ Sagebrush habitat                                                                          |
| Malheur Access/Travel Management starts implementation this fall | Southeast Oregon RMP       | partner funding proposals for restoration stewardship for groups linked with Malheur and Fremont-Winema |
| Tri-Forest Blue Mountains planning effort                        | Lakeview RMP               | travel management on BLM                                                                                |
| Veg EIS stepdown NEPA range/grazing allotments                   | Ruby Pipeline<br>Baker RMP | wilderness characteristics evaluated for WSAs                                                           |

**Confirming Subgroup Assignments**

Current groups: North Lake Plan – subgroup assignment can move into a larger umbrella group (probably travel mgt); Fremont-Winema Travel Management – subgroup assignment can probably move into travel management); and Herbicide Planning – continue as part of the vegetation management group

Groups for 2010: Energy, Vegetation Management, Travel Management, Planning, Sagebrush

Input about WHB – need to make sure the higher levels know that it’s an issue for Oregon managers and we have input. RAC wants to have it on the agenda for regular updates as we wait for the correct timing to form a subgroup

**Q:** What things has the RAC done in the past that has been helpful?

**A:** The RAC formed subcommittees to break out chapters of planning documents so they could explore more fully. They also helped to organize public focus groups for some planning topics. They weighed in on national policy issues so the agency leaders have a better understanding of the impacts. Subject matter experts have provided insights to special topics, such as herbicide use.

**Subgroup Formation Chair noted in bold italic type**

| <b>ENERGY</b>         | <b>VEGETATION MANAGEMENT</b> | <b>TRAVEL MANAGEMENT</b> | <b>PLANNING</b>     | <b>SAGEBRUSH</b>    |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Kevin Peterman</b> | Wannie Mackenzie             | <b>Mona Drake</b>        | Jim Bishop          | Wannie Mackenzie    |
| Dick Leever           | Diane Pinney                 | Dick Leever              | Mona Drake          | Mike King           |
| Mike King             | <b>Chad Boyd</b>             | Bill Renwick             | <b>Bill Renwick</b> | Bill Renwick        |
| Bill Renwick          | Craig Foster                 | Richie Johnston          | Diane Pinney        | Diane Pinney        |
| Jim Walls             |                              | Craig Foster             | Mike King           | Chad Boyd           |
|                       |                              | Larry Hammond            | Larry Hammond       | Larry Hammond       |
|                       |                              |                          | Ken Kestner         | <b>Craig Foster</b> |

**Phase II Blue Mountain Plan Revision**

Blue Mountain Forest Plan began in 2004 under the Forest Service 2000 planning rule. There have been many shifts in the planning rule foundation in the past decade, so right now the Forests are operating under the 1982 rule on current planning documents. There was extensive public input over the earlier iteration of the Blue Mountain Plan, so that feedback was used in this version. The Forest expects to receive public comment in 2011, and go final with this plan in 2012, with the Regional Forester signing. The planning team is hosted in Baker City at the Wallowa-Whitman Supervisor’s Office. The team has had changes, but current roster has been in place for several years now, lending some continuity. This is primarily a zoning document – managing different areas based on mandates or suitability for the location. NEPA documents will be done for specific areas: wilderness, Wild and Scenic Rivers, recreation sites, viewsheds, Standards & Guidelines for wildlife & fish, forest health & resiliency, and grazing. Fire risk is a major concern, especially considering the impacts of climate change. Current management direction will be rolled into this plan. Some travel management decisions can be determined at Forest level, based on suitability. The Malheur National Forest is classified “Open”

unless defined changes are made. There will be a placeholder for timber ASQ, but it will depend on analysis of specific forest areas. There is no guarantee that the forest can meet the stated ASQ; totals will depend on funding, suitability. Identification of management indicator species will be part of the analysis effort. The overall plan speaks to objectives (the ideal), not commitments.

The plan includes recommend additional wilderness, tied to existing wilderness areas. It does not presently address energy projects, but that could be pulled into the alternatives if the need is there. Modeling will be done for the climate change effects, and management will try to be adaptive to those findings. The human component is being considered in the future management. Timeline sets NEPA start for this spring, with issue identification this summer. Effects-analysis will be conducted in the fall/winter so that they can release the draft EIS in March 2011. Once the planning effort is concluded, they look at implementation in 2012

**Q:** Why didn't they consider energy project?

**A:** Teresa doesn't know, but will find out and e-mail to the RAC facilitator.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Teresa will gather information about the choice not to include energy as part of the plan revision, and send it to Mark Wilkening to forward to RAC members.

**Q:** Why is there a funding issue on ASQ? Can the Forest define the inventory of trees by size categories?

**A:** The commercial component for thinning projects is not a saw-log measure, so defining it becomes problematic. A portion of timber sales historically went to the counties, but the thinning and stewardship sales are not handled in the same way.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Teresa will ask if there is a better way to break out the timber classes so that the public can have a clearer idea of what the timber totals mean in the plan.

**Q:** Will the plan look at energy corridors?

**A:** The current plan does not model any of that.

**COMMENT:** This is a national issue and is coming our way no matter what. We will face it and it would be better to prepare for it now.

The Forest Service can do plan amendments that can include definitions, diameter classes, and energy corridors. Some modeling exists for volume of biomass and other classification. Better to be prepared for the likely issues that will come up.

The 21" measure was an arbitrary fixed point to define old-growth. That standard provides a shortcut way to refer to timber volume.

Proponents of energy projects have very specific proposals, so it might be wiser that the forest does not address the issue as an overarching structure. It's hard to cover all of the angles with one statement,

except where the Forest will NOT allow development. The other items might be hard to foresee or prepare for.

***Energy Project Team – Tim Barnes, Energy Section Chief***

The team was established three months ago. Consists of five team members situated in Prineville – they have no decision authority, but the team of specialists is there to provide support to all districts as they get incoming proposals or as they have questions. The team coordinates meetings with other agencies, DOE, FWS, FS, DOGAMI, proponents. All energy projects come within their purview: wind, geothermal, ROW applications, and assistance on RMPs.

**Q:** Can you talk about the scope of projects currently underway?

**A:** There are project managers for specific projects, and the team coordinates with the State Office for efforts that cross District boundaries. Not just alternative energy, but all aspects – O&G, LNG, geothermal, wind, biomass,

**COMMENTS:** The team has been most helpful on the Glass Buttes project, as they provided coordination for all the aspects between the neighboring districts and the proponent.

**Q:** Are you working on a wind energy project outside of Bend, or one at Beatys Butte Backscatter site?

**A:** So far, their only projects are what Districts have referred. There are some on private lands that will go on the list as the team finds out about them, even if they're not on Federal land. If on private land without a connection to BLM, the team will not have a role. There is talk of a solar project in Christmas Valley, but that effort does not impact the BLM.

**Q:** Is the team coordinating with the Forest Service on Newberry?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** It looks like there is no biomass project on the list. Is that right?

**A:** Those projects were underway before the team was formed, so have not included them yet. They'll be added as time goes along.

**Q:** Does the BLM have any solar project involvement?

**A:** Not yet. The Department of Energy is issuing money for grants; BLM has none.

**Q:** Is there a vision as far as planning for these projects, rather than case-by-case?

**A:** Yes. The BLM is looking at it from a habitat standpoint, because we realize there are many affected aspects of resource management. Solar emphasis for the agency has largely been in states south of here.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Mark will get the updated energy project roster from Tim Barnes ahead of all meetings so it can be distributed to members prior to meetings.

**Q:** Where is all the energy going? It looks like there is a lot of voltage

**A:** Many of the proposals are for MET test towers. Proponents explore the transmission methods **if** the site has potential for commercial production. Transmission capability is being considered on a national scale.

**Q:** Is anybody looking at local distribution of the energy produced?

**A:** Yes. The technology is moving so quickly that they have to look at all aspects of it.

**COMMENTS:** The Governor proposed that 20% of energy produced here should be retained in the state by 2025. In looking at the list, many of these proposals are speculative. It's hard to tell if they'll happen, or what level of energy can be produced. Businesses are looking at what the opportunities for capital might be. Some focus is on what areas have transmission capabilities or how it can serve local needs to take some cities/sites off the grid. Many possibilities to scale it to meet local need

#### ***Energy Opportunity Mapping – Kenny McDaniel***

Opportunity mapping effort was done for visioning energy expansion on the BLM. Eastern Oregon has the largest un-fragmented sagebrush habitat out there. We will need to coordinate what we do on a regional basis, allowing for sage grouse, deer habitat, pygmy rabbits, ACECs, wilderness, special designations, military flight zones, etc. The mapping effort took all of the key habitats, special lands, military, etc. and put on a shade-of-gray kind of framework. Adaptations can be made for seasonal closures or other mitigations. The BLM is withholding their map, to allow coordination with the State of Oregon's similar document, so that project approvals won't have negative impacts on the adjoining lands.

**COMMENT:** There is another group who has done a similar exercise. Theirs includes some added elements, but they were done separately.

#### ***Sagebrush – Jeff Rose, Conservation Restoration Coordinator***

BLM is producing eco-regional assessments, based on EPA level 3 Ecoregion standards. The Northern Great Basin ecoregion includes Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, Northern California, Utah, and tiny parts of Wyoming. The standards varied in the states, and the team needed to show why. The Northern Great Basin was a pilot for taking that data and reporting it. They've just completed the two-year effort. The step-down effort in Oregon will go from the ground up instead of from the top down, so that data accuracy on resource values and risk agents can be verified before the work gets prioritized. Goal is to make the choices about where the greatest benefit can be realized most effectively. Factors included plant communities, fire risk, occupied habitat, etc. Working group advising the SLT will recommend the projects they see with the most potential.

The team must begin considering aquatics and climate change, by direction from national office. They will incorporate the results of the climate change group into their deliberations as well.

**Q:** Would this have a bias toward converted habitats, or those in danger of being converted?

**A:** Those in danger of habitat conversion. Agencies can't fix all the concerns, so will direct their energies where they can do some good.

**Q:** Has the team ceded cheatgrass?

**A:** No. They're doing some rehab where it makes sense, but is mostly focused on other things.

**Q:** Are we seeing policy being driven by the findings of this team yet?

**A:** The team was chartered by the State Leadership Team (SLT) in response to new policy, and has SLT blessing to go do great things. Some paradigm shifts still must occur, but this is a new way of doing business for the BLM. The data they're getting is helping to refine their analysis.

**COMMENT:** Sagebrush is one of the priorities for the DOI and OR/WA BLM, so funding can be directed to these efforts.

### ***Fremont-Winema Travel Management Plan – Robert Wetherell via videoconference***

Rollout of the plan is set for April 19<sup>th</sup>. There is a new brochure coming that explains the revised alternatives, but Erica provided the last one as a help for viewers to see Robert's presentation. If it's OK, the Forest will send the info to all RAC members.

Robert is the recreation program manager for the Fremont-Winema NF. It has the largest forest road system in the country. The rule was prompted by the growth in unmanaged travel on forest lands. Officials were directed to close areas that were experiencing resource damage. The plan allows better opportunities for sustained use of routes and areas. Travel Rule requirements are: 1) all National Forests will designate routes at local level; 2) travel off those routes will be prohibited; and 3) output requires the Forest Service to issue free motor-vehicle use maps

Forests made a fundamental change to "closed unless posted open" as opposed to former use. This does not address over the snow travel, or other permitted activities, such as access to private in-holding. This is the first effort for the Forest, and will be periodically reviewed and updated based on monitoring. The Forest is taking a two-phase approach: issuing the Environmental Assessment now; Phase II will be on a local level for designated trails, and travel routes by vehicle class. It has been a long process due to many factors – data gathering and public scoping identified the need to change aspects of the plan. Communities wanted the Forest to more completely evaluate the closed road system. There are five maintenance levels for Forest roads, and the Level 1 roads got the most focus (almost 6,000 miles). Groups focused primarily on 1100 miles where there were specific resource concerns that had to be analyzed. The revised plan now has four alternatives for the public to consider.

The preferred alternative only proposes about a 1% change from current status. More than 80% of the Forest is still available as it was. Three key issues were: 1) level of designated roads would affect recreation opportunities 2) Rocky Point would be adversely affected 3) open travel would adversely affect fish & wildlife and property.

Alternative 3 is the preferred alternative, which blends elements of the input from both ends of the spectrum. Employees in the field will carry the maps, to give to people who are recreating on the forest. There are 11 maps to cover the forest in a readable manner. Maps will be available next week, and some Forest staff will be available to help people understand what they're looking at. Public meetings begin April 26 at Lakeview, April 27 in Klamath Falls. Comment period closes May 17, and the Forest will issue the Record of Decision in June. Final revised maps will be issued in the Fall when rules become effective.

**Q:** Is there a large problem with keeping people on the two tracks in the Fremont-Winema? What level of policing will there be to enforce this, or can the forest do a better job of educating the public?

**A:** There hasn't really been a huge problem with that. The intent is to build a system overall, and the focus on project level sites may give the opportunity to provide more. OHV enthusiasts have helped shape the plan to allow options for their use. Kudos to the planners for listening to their concerns.

**Q:** How does one go about recommending other areas?

**A:** The Phase II portion will allow the Forest to target specific places for different vehicle classes, to provide options. The only bid on a contractor to do this came in at ten times the budgeted amount, so the Forest has backed off to see what other avenues might work.

Repeated the thanks to the Forest for their efforts to move in the right direction.

**COMMENT:** Most important to use an independent person to facilitate the use that provides a good recreation experience and challenges along with "treading" lightly on the land. The Forest is very interested in maintaining the coordination they've had with the vehicle clubs.

**Q:** Is there anything specific that the RAC can do to help?

**A:** Comments on the document anytime after Monday is crucial to the plan effort. Individuals can also comment individually. Closing date is May 17.

***PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: No members of the public were present to address the RAC***

***Vegetation EIS – Todd Thompson Handout/Don Gonzalez responding to questions***

**Q:** What comes next in this process?

**A:** These early reviews of the draft are meant to find fatal flaws and refine alternatives before it goes for full public release. There are two items that had caused earlier concerns: herbicides on some native

species, and aerial application. The chemical 2-4-d is still in this overarching plan, but will be addressed in the step-down-NEPA for specific sites. The RAC will get two shots at the Vegetation EIS, and then opportunities with each NEPA document.

**Q:** Can herbicides be used for juniper eradication? By aerial application?

**A:** Yes, they can be used on juniper, but there would be concerns about aerial application because of potential for overspray. Juniper would likely be dealt with by chainsaw or broadcast burn instead.

***Updates on Lakeview & SEOR RMPs – Don Gonzalez/Carol Benkosky***

Both Lakeview and the Southeast Oregon RMPs were litigated. The BLM lost in the case of the SEORMP, and Lakeview was next on the docket. The District chose to withdraw and begin negotiations with the litigant. The resulting agreement is in final review at the Washington Office, but the District will look at the RMP in three areas: analysis of wilderness characteristics, full range of alternatives for the grazing program, and planning a travel management strategy. Other elements have not been pulled into this effort so the District can expedite those issues that were before the Court. One contractor has been brought in to work through this process. The Federal Register Notice was published on April 8, so the District can officially begin public scoping, through July 7, then move ahead. BLM hopes to have a draft EIS out by July 2011, and the final EIS published six months later. May 24-June 4 is the prospective timeframe for public meetings. Likely locations are Lakeview, Christmas Valley, Burns and Bend.

**Q:** Are both Districts in about the same place for their travel management plan?

**A:** Not a lot is completed on Vale; Lakeview has about 95% of the road network identified, and hopes to have a travel management plan be one of the outcomes. Vale will likely handle the travel issues as a separate item.

**Q:** Is there a way to track the dollars expended on court proceedings?

**A:** There's a way to estimate some of it, but you can't capture all the costs specific to any given litigation.

**COMMENTS:** On the Malheur, they look at what work does not get accomplished because of the workload that gets diverted to litigation. Agencies managed for wilderness characteristics for more than 20 years, but the documentation was inadequate for the Courts. We're not amending the RMP, but simply addressing the issues in the Court order.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Don Gonzalez will try to provide some dollar amounts expended by the BLM for response to litigation in recent years.

**Q:** Will meeting the Court requirement require big changes in the way the RMPs are implemented?

**A:** No major changes; there will be better structure for travel management, and a baseline analysis will be completed on wilderness characteristics.

**Q:** Boise, Idaho is running ads all the time encouraging people to vacation in Malheur County. Will there be ways to reduce the impacts of tourism which is at a level that it's changing the landscape?

**A:** The monitoring and having people report issues will be our only avenues to deal with impacts.

**COMMENTS:** The wilderness characteristics of a place get changed as the traffic increases to these places. The likelihood is that the agencies will get sued due to overuse of a place. The variety of recreational pursuits continues to evolve, and it's not easy to project what activities will emerge for all sites.

### **Subgroup preliminary discussions:**

Energy: Need more information on the project plans and rights-of-way concerns with these proposals. It's plausible that the agencies will spend a lot of money on projects that aren't ever implemented.

Vegetation Management: Will study this preliminary draft and have a full RAC meeting by May 6 to meet the deadline for internal comments.

Travel Management: The Fremont-Winema web page has their plan online, so individual letters can be forwarded, and if the group wants to draft any input, that can begin too.

Planning: Working with Lakeview & Southeast Oregon RMPs in whatever capacity will help meet the Court order, and continue with their work on the Blue Mountain Plan.

Sagebrush: Focus on the Vegetation EIS now, but a potential agenda item would be to bring Christian Hagen from Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife to explain the State's sage grouse Core Area Concept and how the Federal and State efforts will meld together. For the RAC, an info briefing will help.

### ***Roundtable***

**Diane Pinney:** The wild horse people look at the current situation as "business as usual." Horses are not being held long enough in short term holding to give them a chance to be adopted.

**Jim Bishop:** Pellet boiler at the hospital has been working spectacularly for three years, so the high school has adopted that technology. The great cost savings outdistances the "green" aspect. They have continual visits from people interested in the possibility of using similar technology. The logic is that it's local, and the best source is local sawmills. From a resource and a cost basis, the mills should be using that biomass waste for co-generation. The most expensive part is hauling the material, so he's very intrigued by the local focus on energy creation and use.

**Bill Renwick:** Strongest interest is in ecosystem restoration, and working with both agencies. The forests are all seeing a struggle with ASQ that is not commercial grade lumber, so he's a strong

proponent for using that biomass instead of disposing of it. There is a balance that can be found. Subsidies are not getting directed toward biomass, so the forests continue to be overstocked.

**Carol Benkosky:** Ruby Pipeline deadlines are coming up soon, but BLM cannot issue a right-of-way right away due to many factors. Many pieces still need to fall into place. Wind development effort going on in the Lakeview District to create and use energy locally. The Oregon National Guard is still interested in the backscatter site, but has also inquired about a firing range for training in the Poverty Basin area, and use it for other training exercises. The training area near Prineville is seeing more situations because of population density. A proposal for a Desert Race is being analyzed for next summer. Horse herds are mobile in the area that overlaps Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge, and Nevada/California. It's necessary to get an accurate population census – the District is working on a Memorandum of Understanding to manage better across that zone by blurring jurisdictional boundaries.

**Q:** Fish & Wildlife Service is not required to comply with the WHB Act. Can advantages be found that way?

**A:** They tend to manage horses in a similar way to the BLM.

**Don Gonzalez:** Info update distributed.

**Erika Hupp:** The Forest is doing some work on Ruby Pipeline, but very busy with the Travel Management Plan, and preparing for field season. A supplement will be published in the Herald & News telling about the forest, and the website is being updated ahead of primary recreation season.

**Teresa Raaf:** Weed plan is coming to a conclusion now. The main focus for the Forest has been ARRA projects, with roads, infrastructure, community efforts, recreation sites, and land restoration. Stewardship Contracting project was a big thing for the area. Many local hires coming on staff this summer; 50 of them will begin data gathering that can be used in future NEPA efforts. Restoration is focused east of Hwy 395 and from Logan Valley south to end of the Forest in Harney County. She can send the forest update to Mark for shipment to RAC members if desired.

**Mike King:** Pass

**Chad Boyd:** Amazed with the number of project proposals for energy, and wants to make sure that there is a conscientious focus on coordinating all of that. It's hard to influence national policy on wild horse topics, but it has been very useful to submit articles to media outlets to get the message out to the general public. Building awareness with an objective set of data could be helpful.

**Dick Leever:** This has been a good meeting; good to see the subgroups get a running start on their topic areas. Looking forward to working with the small groups and agencies to work through these issues.

**Kevin Peterman:** He's excited about the Energy Team and working with Tim Barnes. Sees that this could snowball into something much larger, so it needs to be dealt with. Glad to be here.

**Mona Drake:** Distributed Tri-Power publication for anyone interested. She also had a flyer about the conversion of an abandoned mine to an OHV play area. It is a family activity that gets kids outdoors. If you don't build it or manage it, they'll still come.

**Craig Foster:** Sage grouse counts are occurring right now, and all populations seem to be up. The census is not concluded yet, but numbers approach the 2004 levels. Biologists are not seeing West Nile evidence in the Sage grouse, which is good in one sense, but it also means that they have absolutely no immunity and are not building any. It could exist in the population, but they haven't detected any birds who were exposed and survived.

**Kenny McDaniel:** Many gathers around the state, but district had Palomino Buttes and South Steens, bringing in about 500 head. The internet adoptions have been going pretty well. Crew does a great job! Burns District is working on the comprehensive recreation plan right now. Steens Mountain Advisory Council will focus on that as soon as they can meet. Loop Road reconstruction is an ARRA project that has concluded Phase I; now they'll start working on the first segment of the road itself. Burnt Car settlement talks came to an impasse, so it went to Court. Strong recommendation for mediation, which could start soon. North Steens restoration project is underway. Improvements at Moon Reservoir include funding support from the Marine Board for new ramp, facilities. Geothermal effort on private land at Borax Lake will have to transmit power across BLM, so work has begun on getting approvals for that. Five Creeks Restoration project might be a good opportunity to see a cooperative effort on a full landscape scale.

**Larry Hammond:** Came with a big agenda on his mind – how we do information-sharing right down to the street level – is there anything similar in the BLM? Does the public need to know what's going on, and what mechanism is there for getting that information distributed to the public? The public expresses surprise when a big project occurs and nobody knows about it before the fact. He has the same concern with bid opportunities or potential jobs where the community may have a strong interest but might not have a way to find out about them.

**COMMENTS:** We need to hear more from the general public to tell them what we're doing, get their perspectives, and answer their questions. Could we establish an inbox for the public to contact the RAC or specific interest area reps?

**Wannie Mackenzie:** Humbled to join the committee. The ranchers are doing OK.

**Pam Robbins:** Update on RAC recruitment

### **Scheduling meetings for 2010:**

Preferred timing is tied to a weekend – either Thursday/Friday or Monday/Tuesday

July 12, 13 @ Burns DO – field visit to Five Creeks on Monday

September 20, 21 @ Ontario – field visit to wind energy site on Tuesday Realty/Rights-of-Way agenda topic

November 9 @ Lakeview

**Agenda items for next meeting:**

NEPA Process

Melding the sage grouse Opportunity Maps with the State version

Wild Horse & Burro

Subgroup Reports

Lakeview & Southeast Oregon RMPs

Subgroup work period as part of meeting schedule

Litigation updates

Roundtable

Adjourned @ 4:25 p.m.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Mark Wilkening to call around to subgroup chairs before each meeting to see if they will need time on the agenda for material their group would like to present.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Teresa Raaf will send information about the choice not to include energy as part of the plan revision, and send it to Mark Wilkening to forward to RAC members.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Teresa Raaf will ask if there is a better way to break out the timber classes so that the public can have a clearer idea of what the timber totals mean in the plan.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Mark Wilkening will get the energy project roster from Tim Barnes ahead of all meetings so it can be distributed to members prior to meetings.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Erica Hupp will send the link for the Fremont-Winema Travel Plan to Mark Wilkening to forward to RAC members.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Weed subgroup will send their recommended comments on the Vegetation EIS to the full RAC by April 30 so that members are prepared for the conference call meeting set for May 6.

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Mark Wilkening will prepare a FR notice for a full RAC conference call meeting on May 6, and reserve the conference call line for the RAC to discuss and adopt/eject recommendation

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** RAC members who wish to comment on the Vegetation EIS individually must submit comments by May 10

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Bring a NEPA person in to clarify and explain the process to the RAC

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Carol will send hard copy of the existing RMP to the planning subcommittee. Mark will send hard copies of the SEORMP to the subcommittee. Teresa will send the draft Blue Mountain plan revision

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Craig Foster will contact Christian Hagen to request that he attend a RAC meeting to explain the coordination between State & Federal agency plans

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Kenny McDaniel will forward some draft information about the Opportunity Mapping effort and sage grouse working group

**\*\*\*ACTION ITEM:** Mark will e-mail a reminder to members of the RAC about the conference call scheduled for May 6