



for the greatest good



Meeting Notes

BLUE MOUNTAINS
FOREST PLAN REVISION - 2015
Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman
National Forests

Public Meeting on Livestock Grazing and the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision

Hosted by North Powder School, Union County, and Baker County
North Powder, Oregon | Nov. 15, 2015

These notes reflect the best efforts of the notetaker to capture the discussion of meeting participants, but in no way are these notes a word-for-word transcript as the notetaker may have unintentionally missed some statements or dialogue. Also, the notes do not attempt to correct or clarify any statements made by participants.

Participants (as they appear on the sign-in sheet): Mark Davidson, Bill Harvey, Ron Lay, Joe Lay, Mac Kerns, Anne Hamann, Lorrie Harvey, Kathleen Keith, Ed Trindle, Jerry Gray, Anne March, Matt McElligott, LaDonn McElligott, Larry Larson, Wanda Ballard, Tork Ballard, Carrie Matthews, Curtis Martin, Cheryl Martin, Seth Bingham, Irene Saphra, Carl Dammann, Jack Southworth (facilitator)

U.S. Forest Service (USFS) participants: Chuck Oliver, Jeff Tomac, Maura Laverty, Josh White, Aric Johnson, Dea Nelson, Sabrina Stadler, Peter Fargo (notetaker)

Organizations represented: Union County, Baker County, Baker County Livestock Association, Oregon Cattleman’s Association, Powder Water District, Morgrass Grazing Association, VP Ranch, North Powder FFA, Forest Access for All, USFS

Welcome from the facilitator, Jack Southworth

Welcome everyone. We are here to talk about the livestock grazing portions of the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision.

Introductions: Who are you, where are you from, and what is your relationship to the National Forest (NF)?

- Local rancher/producer; concerned about forest health, watersheds, catastrophic fires; livelihood of our rural community is connected with the Elkhorn Mountains
- Rancher
- Pack goat user; interested in maintaining access across the Blue Mountains
- Baker Co. Chairman; concerned about the livelihood of our community; there are families here that work and live off the land; they have learned how best to care for the land; the first mandate of the USFS is

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

timber production, then grazing, mining, and water; USFS not taking care of these and want to make sure they do

- Union Co. Commissioner; natural resources are the foundation of our economy; state of natural resources and utilization affect our lives and livelihoods; people here make their living on the land; I want to make sure we listen to them; they are the best experts; want to make sure the plan reflects their needs and still supports good ecology
- USFS Deputy Forest Supervisor, Wallowa-Whitman NF: We want to hear from you; we put a lot of effort into the draft Forest Plan; it went out for public comment, and we learned that we didn't quite hit the mark; we wanted to work closely with our communities to make improvements.
- USFS Forest Plan Revision Range Specialist: Want to provide a brief overview of the briefing paper (handed out at the meeting and attached below, "Livestock Grazing & Grazing Vegetation: Frequently Asked Questions"). There are forage utilization guidelines and streambank alteration guidelines. I want to hear from you. If you have some science to support your recommendation, I would like to know that too.
- USFS Forest Plan Revision Team Leader: I look forward to your input. There is a range of alternatives analyzed in the EIS (three volumes) and a Proposed Revised Forest Plan (preferred alternative); we have hard copies available here if you would like to reference them.

Input and questions around the circle

- We border the NF; concerned about forest health; lack of mgmt. across all forests; grazers put a lot of effort into their grazing practices, and it's an uphill struggle; wolves in our allotments now are a challenge; there is a lot more to grazing on public lands than people realize; I hope this will address challenges and bring to light the good things people are doing.
- I agree with "lack of mgmt." Going back to the Anthony Lakes fire; forest has since just been managed for another fire; concerned about allotments that have been turned back to USFS. Who maintains the improvements that are on that permit during the terribly long time we wait for NEPA to be done? [USFS, Maura Laverty: If the permit is waived back to the USFS, we do not maintain the improvements.] Why do we ask the taxpayers to go back and put improvements in again? The managing agent should maintain. [USFS: I think you're referring to vacant allotments, rather than permits. If we can complete the NEPA process and bring in a new permittee, they will repair the improvements and we will likely help them out after a vacancy. We would look for grant funding as well. Some allotments we have just not had interest in.]
- Preventing catastrophic fires should begin with the management plan. Timber harvest should be based on annual growth. The fire on Dooley Mountain resulted, in part, from grass that had not been grazed. [USFS, Josh White: Those were all active grazing allotments. We had rare conditions that day, a 99% day.]
- Will we see cows next summer on Dooley Mtn? [USFS, Josh White: That will be a challenge.] What was the utilization on Dooley? [Josh: 45-50%]
- Why don't we graze sheep? [USFS: There are two sheep allotments on the La Grande District, and one on the Whitman District. We are not authorizing domestic sheep grazing in Big Horn Sheep areas; we are managing around them.]
- We work with permittees to make modifications. We don't expect radical changes in the grazing program. Being part of the process is important.
- There have been prescribed fires around our allotments; we would like USFS to inform us about what they are going to do and when, just so we have a heads up, can check fencing, gates, etc.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- Here with the high school agriculture program at North Powder School.
- Why does every single alternative close large portions of the forest to pack goat use? [USFS Forest Plan Team Leader: We identified issues when developing alternatives; we didn't hear anything out about this one, so we didn't develop a range of alternatives.] We submitted a list of mitigation measures. We ask that you include these and analyze them in alternative(s). Another Q: What type of risk analysis will be used? Will there be low or zero risk for contact between pack goats that might be diseased and big horn sheep? There is a test, and we're willing to get our goats tested. [USFS Forest Plan Team Leader: We are using a risk analysis, similar to the Payette Model for domestic sheep. Domestic sheep and pack goats transmit similarly, so we are treating pack goats as we would domestic sheep. It is up to the line officers to decide the level of risk they are willing to take; that has yet to be decided.] So you don't know how you are going to assign probabilities of transmission? [USFS: Not yet.] We are looking for a true risk assessment. Are you aware of the difference between pack goats and domestic sheep? [USFS: Yes. Our consultation biologist is analyzing all of the material submitted.]
- I have seen deterioration in forest health; a lot of it is because your hands are tied by lawsuits and regulatory agencies like the Fish and Wildlife Service. Our allotment has a lot of brush; encroachment by trees is reducing forage; I believe we can do a better job, and hopefully this plan will take us there. What are the acres based on in the briefing paper? [USFS: Based on active allotment acres that are deemed capable and suitable; there is a capability model with proximity to water, slope, vegetation type, etc.; then we look at allotment-level NEPA to verify suitability.]
- One other note to take home: We are not getting enough active feet on the ground from you guys. We get into lawsuits if we don't have adequate public records, and we need better monitoring to back us up. You need to hire some more people.
- Hard to handle cattle without trails, bridges, etc. Please contact us and let us show you what we use/need. Also, sometimes gates are left open by USFS people (may be fire staff), and we need to prevent this.
 - USFS: As activities are happening on your allotments, please reach out to your range staff. Also, please bring these concerns to spring/fall meetings regarding your allotments. If there are issues with the fire teams, I want my range staff to know about it and be in contact with you.
- Inventory data is important. Need better vegetation maps. Many ranchers are here during the tenure of several range managers. Every time somebody leaves, we need to bring you people up to speed.
- Look at the allotment plans. I want to see more positive than I see negative. If you're doing your job at the USFS, there should be more positive progress.
- Last point: I hear people say, "Get the literature." It takes two years after you begin research on a project to get it into a journal. It's often generic and provides guidance, but it doesn't trump site-specific information. This is the case for the riparian data; it was picked up and applied forest wide, but there was no basis behind it.
- How many acres were suitable and actually grazed? [USFS: The numbers on pg. 1 of the briefing paper are from active allotments. There are more acres of suitable range in Appendix G of the EIS. Alternative D represents the maximum commodities because it includes vacant allotment suitable acres.]
- It would be good to clarify how many acres are being grazed right now. How many AUMs right now? [USFS: If it is vacant, the allotment isn't closed, but it's just not currently being used. We are at 80,500 AUMs on the Wallowa-Whitman NF. Refer to Alt A.]
- Doesn't feel like the understanding of local people is being heard and fully appreciated. The president's agenda in his budget is to reduce grazing allotments, using the Endangered Species Act. Solution: Use local people and local information to solve problems, instead of waiting for the forests to burn. We are seeing

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

more fires now than we were 25 years ago when we were logging. We want to solve the problem, but there is so much red tape.

- I think logging, thinning, and grazing are really important. You can't do any of this without access. Access is the key to everything. I have seen evidence that places that were logged and grazed did better in the fires. During the Windy Ridge Fire near Baker, a Caterpillar had to come down from Sumpter to open a road, so we could fight the fire. That's a waste of precious fire-fighting time.
- This is our community; this is where we make our living and home; hopefully we will have economic opportunity to stay here and keep our kids here. A solution is Coordination: People who live in this community should have more say-so than those from west side of the state. The frustration level that I feel is the same I felt with the BLM and sage grouse. We need to get back to local decision-making. We are producing about 150-fold of what our ancestors did, because we have better management. These documents can create a choke-hold on our communities if they don't coordinate with those who know the land.
- There is a lack of trust for a lot of reasons with government. The federal government is depending on income from grazing, but you are not getting those benefits. Solution: Step back out of our lives and let us have more say with the land that we love. We will trust you more if you intervene less.
- USFS gets marching orders from somewhere else. It has been pointed out that the data is wrong. If younger people coming up in the USFS are learning the wrong information, then they will not manage well. There are more regulations that stop us from doing what we need to do rather than the other way around. NEPA is supposed to be about balance, also with economics. If you clear the land, you can get more grazing, water, etc. But we're not allowed to anymore, because somebody says so based on philosophy and control. We have 150 years of experience here in Baker County; just let us use it.
- Common theme around the circle so far is we have deteriorating resources that are not being well-utilized; lack of communication between USFS and users; natural resources are foundation of our economy and why we came to this land; need to get back to a point where we are utilizing all resources available to us for the benefit of ecology, and most importantly, the needs of our human population. The Forest Plan as currently conceived does not work for us; discouraged that the Preferred Alternative will be more of the same. A solution is more grazing on suitable lands; need to more actively market inactive allotments.
- A lot of these issues have to do with communication. Trust issues. It is possible to have an ombudsman who works in the middle—somebody who communicates with both sides? Solution: An ombudsman who facilitates. Those big documents are the result of a regulatory process. It's hard on even the USFS, and understanding what they have to deal with is good for everyone.
- I'm interested in the interface between grazing and the waterways. I value salmon habitat and bull trout habitat. I value banks that are not destroyed by cows. I represent a fair number of people who value that. I'm in favor of anything in this plan that helps keep the waterways and riparian areas healthy. I don't know what the grazing fees are, or if they are enough to cover the costs of keeping the cattle out of the waterways. I live downstream and think the water downstream belongs to all of us.
- Are we considering the need to double food production to meet global demands of a growing population? [USFS: I don't think we included that in the economic section, no.]
- Good management of riparian areas doesn't always require exclusionary fencing. Oregon State University conducted a years-long study, which found that the number of reds coming up Catherine Creek were higher in areas that weren't completely exclusionary. Nobody values wildlife more than ranchers. If you manage right, the human element can play a significant role. It's really hard to have aquatic habitat if the stream is dry.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

Summary of what was heard: Maura Laverty, USFS Forest Plan Revision Range Specialist

- I heard a lot of administration issues pertaining to allotment-level NEPA and permit administration; I am struggling to incorporate all of this feedback into alternatives of the Forest Plan.
- Heard about deterioration of vegetation and deterioration of the forests.
- The full set of pack goat challenges were not on my radar until we began the re-engagement meetings; I want to give you credit for bringing it to my attention.
- Suitable acres and AUMs: Only one alternative included the vacant allotments when I inherited the analysis; I would like to see vacant allotments suitable acres included in all but one alternative.
- Communication is in everything we do. We are taking notes and sharing what we have heard.
- Collecting better inventory data is on a District level and Forest level, in cooperation with our ecology group. We used the best information we had available.
- Active management; hearing that a lot; people want to see more use of the resources.
- Balancing the resources means different things to different people.
- Ombudsman between ranchers and the Forest Service; I like that idea.
- Valuing watersheds and aquatic species; we spend a lot of time on those and we have an obligation to follow many laws and regulations.

Second round of input

- Leave an opening in your Forest Plan, so you can update the inventory with better information. In the short time I have lived here, we have gone through so many different regimes of planning. There is no section in this plan that refers to old plans and how we have departed. Keep in mind that cows spend less than 1% of the time in riparian zones.
- Forest Rangers used to ride with us and help us; now they can't because of conflict of interest. About vacant permits: Like the sheep herders, people quit because of regulations; it can get expensive to run livestock up in the mountains; you are not getting the grass for nothing.
- I heard you say that pack goats were not on the radar, but we submitted comments in 2014. Hopefully, pack goats are on your radar now. I don't think it's a good idea to include pack goats with domestic sheep or even free-ranging goats; it is more of a recreational use. If we can truly work with you and help you analyze the risk of disease transmission, I think we can reduce the risk to near zero. Let's use good science and do a rigorous analysis. There is new science to test our animals for disease.
- How long do USFS employees stick around? It seems that every five years, once you get to know and like someone, they move on.
- Baker County Chairman: We handle that problem by trying not to like them too much. (just kidding)
- USFS: Communication is important; I think we have had a lot of good discussion.
- Thank you for putting in your evening and listening to us.
- Thank you for coming over; communication is important; we are all environmentalists and make our living here; would like to think we do a pretty good job with our land.
- Thank you to the lady who brought up water quality; another challenge is elk; the population has increased six-fold; elk can do significant damage to riparian areas.
- Thank you; Forest Service has a lot of good people doing good studies out there, and I think we should take a look at them.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- I like this format of going around the circle.
- USFS: My job is to listen and help my Permittees.
- I am encouraged; I think Maura is really listening and sincerely wants to improve the grazing section of the Forest Plan.
- Maura, I like your thoughts on more grazing, but what about the next person in your position? We need to use the grazing to control the fire risks. There may be administration problems, but the administration staff need to follow rules; we need to change rules that are not working, whether in the Forest Plan, in the Region, or in DC.
- Communication is only good when there is positive action that comes out of it. Without positive action, we have wasted our communication.
- Sometimes a better understanding is the action and the best result of communication.
- There is a wealth of knowledge and stewardship within our local community; there needs to be a re-emphasis and evaluation of efforts that have gone in before us.
- Has there been any progress on the Preferred Alternative? Have there been any corrections? I would like to see some forward movement on what is happening at this time.
- Have been to a lot of meetings; heard a lot of good things from a lot of good people, and I hope it is being used.
- Are the grazing fees going to go up to \$2.50? [USFS: I don't know. It is unlikely, because grazing fees can only go up 25% in any given year. I believe they are trying to include an administration fee to get more money to the Districts.]
- Working in a mining company is my background; I was in middle management; I know your (USFS) hands are tied, so we need to take this up to the next notch of management to get the answers we need.
- Thanks for having this meeting. How much more time do we have to provide input to you? [USFS: This is our last grazing meeting. We are putting notes together and deciding what additional analysis may be needed.]
- Is "no action" an alternative, so you have more time to work with communities? [USFS: Yes, that is Alt. A.]
- USFS: I appreciate all of your time and input.

Closing remarks by Chuck Oliver, Deputy Forest Supervisor, Wallowa-Whitman NF

- Transparency is important; that is what this process is about.
- Don't let your questions go unanswered; keep asking; follow up or elevate your request.
- Some common themes that I have heard:
 - Mismanagement. I assure you that we are managing the forests, but we may not be getting it right.
 - Catastrophic fire: We saw it last summer.
 - Natural resources are the foundation of our economy.
 - Sheep and pack goat issue.
- If you see a problem, don't assume that we have thought of a solution; let us know what you think.
- Science: We need to use the best-available science; it is helpful, but it is "old" as soon as it's done. We are doing a static analysis of a dynamic process, so we need to use the information on the ground from you as well.
- Those are some of the common themes we have been hearing at these meetings, and that is a good thing. The ombudsman idea is new, and we should look at that.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- We need a new Forest Plan, because there are things in the old (but still used) Forest Plan that aren't working as intended. (Q: What is an example?) For example, 21" screens have limited timber harvest across the board to trees less than 21" DBH. That doesn't always make sense.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

Livestock Grazing & Grazing Vegetation: Frequently Asked Questions

How many acres will be available for grazing?

Appendix G has the acreages broken down by Allotment name and Alternative. Appendix G starts on page 427 in Volume 3 of the DEIS. The total acres suitable for livestock grazing on the Malheur National Forest are 1,197,000 for cattle and 101,000 for sheep. The total acres suitable for livestock grazing on the Umatilla National Forest are 284,000 for cattle and 42,000 for sheep. The total acres suitable for livestock grazing on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest are 408,000 for cattle and 25,000 for sheep.

How are Sage grouse addressed with regard to grazing management in the Proposed Revised Forest Plan?

There is a relatively small amount of sage-grouse habitat on the Blue Mountains Forests. Sagebrush steppe habitat was estimated to occur on approximately six percent of the landscape within the Malheur National Forest; however, not all of this is considered sage-grouse habitat. Habitat mapping completed by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) indicates that only 41,600 acres is considered greater sage-grouse habitat, and of this, 30,000 has been mapped as core habitat, and the remainder as low density habitat. Sagebrush steppe habitat was estimated to occur on less than one percent of the landscape for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, but according to ODFW a little more than 3,000 acres within the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest would be considered sage-grouse habitat, most of which is mapped as core habitat. The greater sage-grouse is not expected to occur within the Umatilla National Forest.

The Preferred Alternative retains the Alternative B (Proposed Action) modified management direction with the following addition: In greater sage-grouse habitat, fence construction within one mile of known leks (protected activity centers) and seasonal high use areas should not be authorized or allowed. Fence construction on the crest of low hills should not be authorized or allowed unless the fence is marked with anti-strike markers.

Grazing utilization within occupied greater sage-grouse habitats should not exceed 40 percent at any time during the grazing season and will be determined specifically for each greater sage-grouse habitat, i.e., grazing utilization measured as an average of the entire pasture or grazing unit will not be used to determine compliance with this guideline.

During greater sage-grouse breeding season, livestock turnout and trailing should avoid high concentrations on known greater sage-grouse leks (protected activity centers).

Where did the riparian utilization standards come from?

The new utilizations Guidelines were proposed in response to the need for accelerated restoration for aquatic habitat and species. The Guidelines are meant to balance the Preferred Alternative with aquatic and riparian resource concerns.

Why does the Proposed Revised Forest Plan reduce the riparian allowable forage utilization for livestock within riparian management areas? What will happen if my allotment has a higher utilization level authorized in riparian management areas than the Revised Forest Plan does?

Alternative E, the preferred alternative, proposes to increase the pace and scale of restoration. Decreasing the amount of utilization in riparian management areas would help to move them toward the desired condition. Once the Revised Forest Plan is in place, the term grazing permits for each allotment will be modified to replace the 1990 Forest Plan language with the Revised Forest Plan language. However, site-specific environmental analysis and consultation for threatened and endangered species will need to be completed on all of the allotments as each allotment management plan is revised, which will determine the appropriate level of utilization for your specific allotment.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

What is a *Silene spaldingii*? There is a standard in the Proposed Revised Forest Plan that livestock grazing isn't allowed where that plant exists. Why is grazing a hazard for it?

Silene spaldingii is a listed threatened plant species under the Endangered Species Act. Spalding's Catchfly is the common name. The reason for the standard is that trampling from livestock grazing affects its growth and ability to reproduce. It is listed because there are very few plants. With that standard, we want to manage the timing of grazing; it's not a desirable plant for cow forage. We work with local Permittees to help them identify the plant and they have been able to work around it.

Why wasn't a range of alternatives analyzed for grazing (no grazing alternative and an unlimited grazing alternative)?

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the agency to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives. The EIS for the Blue Mountains Forest Plans analyzed an alternative with significantly reduced grazing (Alternative C), and an alternative with grazing above current levels (Alternative D). Furthermore, Alternatives G and J (Minimum Management Alternative and No Grazing Alternative respectively) which would have eliminated grazing, were considered but eliminated from detailed study.

In addition, Forest Service Managers are responsible for ensuring compliance with the following laws, regulations, and policies which require multiple use management:

Organic Administration Act of 1897: Gives regulatory authority to the President to establish National Forests. Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate rules and regulations for the use and occupancy of National Forests.

Taylor Grazing Act of 1934: Intended to "stop injury to the public grazing lands [excluding Alaska] by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; [and] to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range".

Granger-Thye Act of 1950: Provides for the issuance of term grazing permits for up to 10 years. It also provides for the use of grazing receipts for range improvement work.

Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960: Provides that national forests are established and administered for several purposes, including livestock grazing. This act also authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to develop the surface renewable resources of national forests for multiple uses and sustained yield of the services and products to be obtained from these lands, without impairment of the productivity of the land.

Wilderness Act of 1964: Provides that livestock grazing, and the activities and facilities needed to support it, are allowed to continue in wilderness areas when such grazing was established before designation.

Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resource Planning Act of 1974: Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a process for the revision of national forest land and resource management plans, including the identification of the suitability of lands for resource management.

Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976: States that public lands will be managed in a manner that will provide food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals.

National Forest Management Act of 1976: Reorganized, expanded and otherwise amended the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, which called for the management of renewable resources on National Forest Lands. The NFMA requires the Secretary of Agriculture to assess forest lands, develop a management plan for each unit of the National Forest System. It is the primary statute governing the administration of National Forests.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978: Establishes and reaffirms the national policy and commitment to inventory and identify current public rangeland conditions and trends; manage, maintain and improve the condition of public rangelands so that they become as productive as feasible for all rangeland values in accordance with management objectives and the land use planning process; charge a fee for public grazing use which is equitable; continue the policy of protecting wild free-roaming horses and burros from capture, branding, harassment, or death, while at the same time facilitating the removal and disposal of excess wild free-roaming horses and burros which pose a threat to themselves and their habitat and to other rangeland values.

Rescission Act of 1995: Directs the Forest Service to complete site-specific NEPA analyses and decisions on allotments on a scheduled basis.
36 CFR 222

Forest Service Manual 2200: This manual summarized laws and regulations governing rangeland management and forest planning.

Forest Service Handbook 2209.13: Grazing Permit Administration Handbook

Allotment Management Plans: Developed through site-specific environmental analysis, an allotment management plan uses Forest Plan direction and current issues to determine desired conditions, areas suitable for grazing, and a broad strategy on how to meet desired conditions. They describe site-specific grazing strategies, stocking, structural and nonstructural range improvement needs, and coordination with other resources. The output, or animal unit months (AUMs), is a result of the allotment management plan requirements, range improvements, and the ability of the permit holder to manage forage and livestock.

Non-Use for Resource Protection Agreements: These agreements may be entered into to provide long term non-use needed to address recovery of rangeland resource conditions, provide forage on a temporary basis to allow resource recovery on other area grazing units, provide temporary resolution of conflicts created by bighorn sheep or wolf predation on livestock, or provide supplemental forage in times of drought to assist area livestock operators and lessen the resource impacts of grazing.

Where can I find information on Livestock Grazing and Grazing Vegetation in the EIS?

Standards & Guidelines

Plant Species (Federally listed & species at risk) (Appendix A pg 120)

Species Diversity Riparian Habitat (Appendix A pg 119)

Range Management & Domestic Livestock Grazing (Appendix A pg 125) includes:

- Grazing After Wildland Fire (Appendix A pg 125)
- Grazing Near BHS (Appendix A pg 126-127)
- Grazing within Occupied Sage Grouse Habitat (Appendix A pg 125 & 126)
- Upland Forage Utilization (Appendix A pg 125)
- Upland Shrub Utilization (Appendix A pg 126)

MA 4B (Riparian Management Areas) - Appendix A pages 91 & 140-141

Livestock Grazing and Grazing Land Vegetation – Volume 1, Chapter 3, pages 126-159

How are bighorn sheep addressed in the plan with regard to grazing?

There are several Standards and Guidelines outlined in the Plan that are intended to prohibit disease transmission between domestic animals and bighorn sheep. They are:

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

RNG-9 **Standard** S-2 Domestic sheep or goat grazing shall not be authorized or allowed on lands where effective separation from bighorn sheep cannot be reasonably maintained.

RNG-10 **Standard** S-3 The use of domestic goats or sheep for manipulation of vegetation (i.e., noxious weed control, fuels reduction) shall not be authorized or allowed within or adjacent to source habitat for bighorn sheep.

RNG-11 **Standard** S-4 The use of recreational pack goats shall not be authorized or allowed within or adjacent to source habitat for bighorn sheep.

RNG-12 **Standard** An effective monitoring program shall be in place to detect presence of bighorn sheep in identified high-risk areas when authorized domestic sheep or goats are present on adjacent or nearby allotments.

RNG-13 **Guideline** Trailing of domestic sheep or goats should not be authorized or allowed within 7 miles of bighorn sheep home ranges.

RNG-14 **Standard** When effective monitoring has not been conducted for bighorn sheep presence, domestic sheep or goat grazing shall not be authorized.

RNG-15 **Standard** Permitted domestic sheep and goats shall be counted onto and off of the allotment by the Permittee. A reasonable effort to account for the disposition of any missing sheep must be made by the Permittee.

RNG-16 **Standard** When permitted sheep are found to be missing, the Forest Service shall be notified within 24 hours.

RNG-17 **Standard** Authorized domestic sheep or goats shall be individually marked in a manner that allows immediate identification of ownership at a distance during the grazing season at all times while on NFS lands.

RNG-18 **Standard** Implement emergency actions when bighorn sheep presence is detected within 7 miles of active domestic sheep or goat grazing or trailing. Actions to be taken shall ensure separation between bighorn sheep and domestic sheep or goats.

RNG-19 **Guideline** To maintain separation, when bighorn sheep are found within 7 miles of an active domestic sheep and goat allotment, implementation of emergency actions for domestic sheep and goat grazing could include: Reroute (move) domestic sheep or goats to a new routing path that will take them away from the likely bighorn movement; this may involve rerouting within the permitted allotment, movement to a different allotment, or, if the situation cannot otherwise be resolved, moving the permitted sheep off of the national forest until the situation can be resolved Inform the appropriate state agency of the bighorn sheep location

Contact Information:

Maura Laverty, Range Program Manager: 541-523-1286

Peter Fargo, Public Affairs Officer: 541-523-1231

Website: fs.usda.gov/goto/BlueMountainsPlanRevision

Would you like to be on the Mailing List?

Email bluemtnplanrevision@fs.fed.us or call 541-523-1231