



for the greatest good

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

Meeting Notes

Public Workshop on Grazing and the Blue Mountains Forest Plans
Hosted by High Desert Partnership and the Malheur National Forest
Burns, Oregon | July 14, 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: Alec Oliver, Tim Purdy, Cindy Purdy, Al Dunten, Carol Dunten, Glen Shelley, Jane Shelley, Melissa Wond, Jack Smith, Fred Hellbusch, Kyle Jackson, Jim Bentz, Kenny Bentz, Gene Scrivner, Colby Marshall, Jerry Temple, John O’Connor, Jay Kimball, Steve Howe, Chris Labhart, Steve Grasty, Tony Svejcar, Jim Campbell, Jim Sproul, Wyatt Smith, John Dryer, Jeff Hussey, Robert Cunningham, Jack Southworth, Brenda Smith (notetaker)

US Forest Service (FS) participants: Steve Beverlin, Sabrina Stadler, Christy Cheyne, Lori Bailey, Melissa Ward, Ben Goodin, Maura Laverty

Organizations represented (as listed on the sign-in sheet): Grant County Court, Burns Times Herald, 3S Cattle Company, Silvie’s Ranch, Rattlesnake Creek Ranch, JC Oliver Inc., US Forest Service

--

Introduction – Jack Southworth, Facilitator, High Desert Partnership: Who are you, where are you from, and if this is a good meeting what would you like to see accomplished?

- What I’d like to see accomplished is that nobody socks each other in the head.
- From the Rattlesnake Creek Ranch, and I have two FS permits.
- I want to go home with information to help make positive changes to the grazing portions of the Forest Plan.
- I commented on the original plan.
- I’m a permittee, and I probably didn’t read the plan that much.
- I’m here because of Steve Grasty.
- What I’d like to accomplish is to learn more about this plan.
- I have a list of things to go through.
- I’m a permit holder.
- I’m a permittee.
- I’d like to hear your guys’ concerns about the plan.
- I worked on the plans 20 years ago.
- I am a concerned citizen.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- I've been here since 1936; don't have a permit but am concerned with the way grazing is done right now.

Short Report from FS range staff:

- I'm going to tell you that I don't know the Malheur NF well. I don't know the allotments. I don't know the permites. I'm relying on others to fill in for me. I ask you guys to take into consideration the differences between standards and guidelines. Standards are something we all have to meet. In this plan, we don't have standards [for the allowable forage utilization in riparian areas in bull trout habitat], we have guidelines.
- What that means is that we have to show that we are meeting the intent of protecting the fish habitat. When we are doing site-specific National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), we ask ourselves, "Are we meeting the guidelines?" If we are not, then we have to adjust the utilization levels.
- Another key point will be the economics, which came up a lot in the comment letters. Compared to current grazing, they haven't changed. The thinking behind that is that even with a guideline; in most cases we aren't even meeting as much forage as we can.
- This is your meeting. Truly why I am here is I am going to be thinking about who is who and who can help me to fix any critical errors, oversights, or things that are wrong with the plan. We are the ones that will have to live with it. What we are looking for are glaring errors.

Questions: Are you OK with the proposed action? If not, why not? What do you suggest changing in order to make the proposed action OK with you?

- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Is the Forest Plan the book that Jack has? Myself, I haven't read this large document. So if you were to tell me the five most important things that document lists, what would they be?
- FS - I would look at the utilization alternatives. Really look at what they say and look at different alternatives. The Regional Forester makes the decisions and the three Forest Supervisors are allowed to take the good parts from the alternatives. Look at all of them. Document what you like about the draft Plan and what you can't live with.
 - Look at riparian areas. In the appendix there are tables that display numbers, which is really helpful.
 - Look at financial consequences of alternatives. That has been worked on by somebody in the Regional Office. I am assuming we are going to keep the Animal Unit Months (AUMs). Appendix G shows allotments and AUMS; please look yours up and make sure they match.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Whenever we are required to measure grass, those spots are in the areas where the cows hit the most. The rest of the pasture doesn't seem to matter. Those areas are right where the cows funnel down. Why do we have to measure the grasses there? For years we have done this. Why can't we go to a medium?
- FS - Typically our key areas are places where a cow is going to use first. We try to keep an eye on them, so you can keep cows in the uplands. It's a distribution issue. That's just where the cows want to be. We need to work on how to get cows where we want them to be. Sometimes salting is a tool.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

Hiring riders costs money. Sometimes we use liquid minerals, but it's going to be riders if they want to make sure the cows stay in the uplands.

- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Well, I've got a lot of questions. Back in the 40's and 50's we were having a lot of logging. Well that logging messed with vegetation. I don't understand why they've cut back permittees and time. Looks like the program is going backward to me. The bottom line is there is less livestock than there were prior to the timber sales. Their logging operation is totally ridiculous.
- FS - I can tell you that in the late 80's and 90's, we called newly cut areas "newly transitional range," and we upped capacity. We realized we never cut back when timber grew back and shaded out the grass, so we had to readjust. Where we should address that is through NEPA but not through the Forest Plan.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - A lot of times the FS doesn't want to help the permittee develop water away from the main water streams.
- FS - We do have a 50% cost share program. We buy the materials and the permittees install troughs. I'd like to think that that is still happening.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - I've got 4 questions. How are your utilization levels determined?
- FS - The idea the team came up with. Less is more. If we had less utilization, it would restore quicker. That is the thought process. It's not necessarily science based.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Talked about 25% utilization level. Is there a way to make that focused on times when the fish are at critical time frame and up it when not critical?
- FS - It's not about the fish. It's about the habitat. We are going to use a quantification method.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - It's strictly about habitat? Not quantitative.
- FS - Assuming if you only use 25% you will have more stability, more stream cover, and it will recover more rapidly with less utilization.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Are you going to look at developing water away from the streams?
- FS - The analysis is already done. We have the ability to develop upland water sources.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Is there any thought to put in language to encourage it to happen? Saying something where it says to help mitigate use on these creek areas we are going to develop....so and so. Can you add that as a guideline?
- FS - two affirmed yes.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Can you put all this stuff in one spot in the Forest Plan? When it's all spread out, it makes it very difficult to track and make comments and not be blindsided by it. It's too scattered.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - We have actually published paper 2004 about regrowth. Link to paper: <http://oregonstate.edu/dept/eoarc/sites/default/files/researchhome/documents/501.pdf>
The thing is if you have no utilization on meadows over time you have a decline in productivity and accumulation of dead materials. There is a balancing act. The idea that no use of any kind will increase productivity is not sound. The maximum of less use is no use, right? The other question I have is I look at lot of riparian conflicts, but I'm wondering do you look at whether there is just no forage left in the

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

uplands? Is there any work to increase forage in the uplands to relieve focus on the riparian areas? If you are concerned about the riparian area being overused, are there areas in the allotments where conifer can be thinned to improve uplands to get the cows out of the creek? I am talking about taking a riparian area that is of concern, looking at entire allotment, and seeing if there is work to be done to increase forage not just in juniper but also in pine.

- FS – With the new vegetation projects we are collecting data at the exact same time while timber is doing the same thing, so if we have issues we can work together. So I think that's been the gap we've had. Range has been playing catch up.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Well, what I can see it's got to do with controlling where the cattle go. But if they could control where their cattle were, they could increase AUMs in some areas. I've visited with people who have said they won't fence off riparian areas and took initiative to herd those cows. Something like that would fit, it would be another expense, but to not lose the whole permit just to preserve the riparian area it would be worth it. Not grazing enough is also almost worse than over grazing. I think we can pull it off. I don't have any vested interested other than what I see.
- FS - Science will be really important in this new plan, but there is a lot of science that points in both directions, so we need local science. How do comments like Kyle's get incorporated into the plan?
- FS - I'm relying on the note takers to get this stuff to me. At some point after I've responded to comments and to letters, I will start tweaking stuff in the plan.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Will this information form a new alternative or embellish an already-existing one?
- FS - I don't think we have enough information to create a new one but to certainly inform and tweak one.
- FS - So, the way we are looking at it is this is an opportunity to hear the comments first hand. We are also looking for new ideas. We got the draft EIS comments from the official comment period from the service provider just last week; we have been mining them ourselves in the interim, so we can be more prepared. We are looking for new ideas and will bring them back to the line officers. I can be pretty certain that they will modify alternatives, but we don't know about creating a whole new one. Basically we don't know how that will shake out. If folks really want to make sure that their exact thoughts are being captured, it would be beneficial to write them down and send them in. We just wouldn't do formal responses as we do for the official public comments.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - I haven't read any of the Plan. One reason to come to this meeting is to try and catch up. I don't know some of my thoughts. There are some things with the monitoring. You have a riparian area; 5 years in a row it looks great, and then one year something happens. One year it was hit hard; then we are in really big trouble. It's like the 5 years don't count for anything. Anyway to say that as a whole we've done a great job? People leave our gates open all the time. Is there anything that addresses anything like that?
- FS - not really. We talk about past grazing and history in NEPA. Hopefully the conditions shouldn't be harmed. This is usually addressed at the allotment level as this is site specific.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- FS - We do take past history into account. We do send out warning letters, non-compliance letters, and more than likely we would just give a notice of concern, that says try and not to let it happen again.
- FS - Hopefully it's captured in the history section, but we would never label certain penalties or allotments.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - She's talking micromanagement. It was a very small area, and it was only me that noticed it. They complain about micro areas. That the way it's always been; it's just the business. I'm just here learning mostly.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - I've got no questions. I'm glad to see that grass is becoming an issue in these projects. In the past, grass hasn't been an issue in a government program. It's always been a by-product of management going on. We have special issues in our allotments. We have one area where we went late last fall, and the palatability of the grass was down, and so all the cows went to the grass down by the creek. You couldn't keep them out of there with anything. And we are basically just moving through. Cows are going to work it over, and we try, but it just doesn't work. Cows are going home. I'm not proud of it when we head out of there but you go back next spring, and it looks just as good. I think I'm with the Purdys here; we have so many problems with gates being left open, it's something we can't manage. I don't want to whine, but we have plenty of help when it comes to cattle movement. It has to do with people who want to protect the forest. I'm glad to see that grass is an issue. It looks nice in the spring again...just as good as the rest of the creek. Just using stubble height on the creeks is causing more of a problem. Part of the allotment should be grazed harder at certain times of the year for the health of the pasture. I personally think that the most detrimental thing to any of those creeks is the beaver. They will build dams, go wash out, build more dams, create gullies, people will argue with that but that's the way it works.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - We still have problems getting cows up to the uplands, even with a rider there 95% of the time.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - In order to move to the desired conditions, there are a number of cost share programs but none for range riders; if this could be used for putting people to work in the forest and range that would help a lot.
- FS - We are very limited on range betterment. On EIS we can't touch appropriated money.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT – First, if there can be discussion among the writers in the upper levels, then we can figure it out. Play around with it to find a pot of money. Second goes towards creation where we have these areas to create riparian pastures that then the cattle remain off the area but at the right time and moment then they can be grazed. But it has to be a pasture, not an enclosure, no other terminology. It has to be called a pasture. Third, about the off-stream stock water development. Language needs to encourage it and go a step further and talk about spring box development and fencing out. Let's start moving away from only using metal tanks. Let's use rubber tanks, so folks won't be able to damage it, or stock or wildlife. Opportunity to relocate MIM sites when it doesn't work. There have been things that redirect the impact, and the MIM sites must be moved; and to tie

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

back to the EIS we need better information on the allotment. But if language that could encourage and allow MIM sights to be moved, and if the Forest Plan could encourage that if it is not in the right sight. Once a Pacfish-Infish Biological Opinion (PIBO) site is set up, they don't want to leave these sites, and they are completely useless. And when we tried to move them, we needed language in the plan to move them.

- FS - We just hosted the PIBO team. They go to a different forest every year. We purposefully chose one stinky site, where we don't do our own monitoring there. Eric Archer is now willing to reconsider moving some sights. They are starting to realize that they can't do it all and are willing to reduce. Now is the time to be documenting to present the data to them. What I can do in the plan is where we could address review of our monitoring sites. The time is ripe for this.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - The next one is there is a lot of language about "thou shalt not use goats" for grazing. I would love to utilize goats for vegetation management. Goats will not graze in a riparian area. They will not get their feet wet. We should be using this species on the national forest. Let's use positive language that says in areas where there are no big horn sheep, the use of goats for vegetation management shall be utilized. It goes back to EIS encouraging that as an opportunity. Great part is that a goat's diet is 15% grass, and rest is shrubs and weeds, and can graze on same ground as cattle and double the profit. I want to graze cows and goats. This is about the overall Forest Plan having language that can encourage that.
- FS - We would entertain those changes in the site-specific NEPA analyses.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Here's an audacious idea. Let's move away from AUMs and get down to total use numbers without arbitrary time lines. Mother nature changes. Things aren't predictable. In order for permittees and the FS to have success in the future, we need to get away from the AUM static turn in/out deadlines, so we could have more flexibility.
- FS - We need boundaries, and we need to have dates on the permit. The flexibility is on the permit.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - This is the last one. There's been some talk about monitoring, but what we don't have as permittees is a way to sit down with the agency as a group, as a grazing team, and evaluate what happened out there on the ground. This was put out there on the Refuge. They put together an evaluation team that would look at what happened out on the ground and what happened to the wildlife, positive/negative, and looked at it as a state of transition. How did that management affect the conditions on the ground? We need a way to evaluate overall how we are doing. Implementation of a grazing team in the long term EIS would help and would help encourage communication and sitting down with each other with ideas for ways to move forward. Move away from the individual conversation. EIS should encourage district grazing team that can sit down with agency partners.
- FS - It's a nice adaptive way to keep improving the process and figure out what worked. It's a really good implementation monitoring idea.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - I'm not against cows in the forest. What is the permittee required to do, and how are they held responsible? This moving in on these creek bottoms and staying there. The

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

other thing last year they were supposed to be out of there, but I went up there and there were 100 cows. I called Ben, and he told me someone left a gate open and they had 3 days to get those cows out. 17 days later they were still in there. In bow season I kept running into the same two bulls. I'm not familiar with all the allotments, but the ones I am close to that I drive in this allotment that I still see cows in November are ones they are just moving into right now. It's not just a cow or two but 40, 50, 60 head. It doesn't seem like anybody is looking at them. Right now there are cows in allotments that they are not supposed to be in. What are the permittees required to do, and how are they held responsible?

- FS - Typically what Ben does if there is a problem is he gives the permittee a call and three days, gives letter of warning, and letter of non-compliance. These administration actions do not belong in the Forest Plan.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - First of all, I didn't read the plan. I don't like reading; I get tired of reading; and it doesn't do you good anyway. I went to a bird meeting, and they gave us five books to read. I'm not on Emigrant, but Prairie City, and I'm not sure how pertinent my worries are, but it seems like all my questions are being answered very well. But a lot of them still aren't being addressed on the ground. We have a timber encroachment problem. Will people like Tony be listened to? We have a lot of science, and science seems to be leading us down the wrong road. Tony has common sense and science. Is the Forest Plan listening to people like Tony?
- FS - There is a tie here that the plan isn't going to address. A lot of this goes back to employee retention. I haven't had the same ranger, supervisor, etc., for two years running. How are we going to do anything on the ground if we can't get good employees on the ground? We have a problem with personnel turnover, with encroachment, and with getting things done on the ground.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - One issue about the turn over—when we worked on the allotments 20 years ago, records weren't really good. If you can't keep people in place then the knowledge needs to be kept in place to help with that. Pictures are a good way to start.
- FS - I barely read the plan. I'm new here. I did have some concerns with the 25% and 40% standards. I would like to see it tied more to the ecological standard of the sites. To have a 25% cut-off to me seems strict, especially if it's in good condition. Saying 25% across the board would be hard for a range person to explain that to a permittee. With the way it's set up now, there is no incentive to be a good ecological steward. To have something built in, so if you are in good ecological condition, you can graze it more intensely. Someone who is doing a good job isn't getting the benefits some people would. I think you should be able to award permittees if they do a good job. In the new Forest Plan, I wouldn't be able to do that.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - I agree with Ben. 25% utilization in all riparian areas? You encourage us to think outside the box, we encourage you to do the same. Tenure keeps coming up in these meetings. Somewhere in the plan, we need to create a forest where people want to stay. Then, you want us to get away from riparian areas, and springs are limited. If we could cost share a well, then that would create abundant water.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - These are my six comments I made back in August. Grazing AUMs on National Forests are a great concern to Grant County citizens. There is no proposal in the Plan to increase AUMs based on actual growth factors. If you don't use the resource, you stand a good chance for uncontrolled wildfire. In this room there are a bunch of resource managers. You are the managers of the managers – they manage the grass. That is the science the plan should recognize. You have to recognize these resource managers. Nowhere in the plan do you state how you are going to utilize the grass. There is nothing that says we are going to go back to historic AUMs when we get a set of standards that everybody has to follow. In the plan you have to use the local knowledge from the permittees that actually know what is going on. Access and travel management is paramount to being able to manage your allotments. And it needs to be historic. We need to not create a special class of citizens. If someone jack straws a creek, then the cattle can't move through it and neither can I. Enhanced restoration. This is a positive thing for grazing. There has to be more grass. There are some AUMs there that should be used. We are either going to eat them, or you're going to burn them. If what was stated about the riparian area was true, then the ranchers would be out of business. Science has to be honest. You need to use local knowledge. And the plan needs to show that. You need to recognize that you do have professionals and those are the appointees that use the land. Grazing is an issue that we really need to move forward with. These allotment owners will not hurt their business. Price of beef doesn't allow for sloppy managers. Historic AUMS need to be utilized. There is going to be more grass available with opening up the canopy, and we need to graze it. One of the problems I have with NEPA is how often it is used across the board in areas it shouldn't be used. Submitted comments last year; was told I would get a response, and I still haven't got a response.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Any verbiage that talks about getting in and grazing on fires sooner?
- FS - Language in the grazing section about fire involves when to graze after fires; depends on location and timing and intensity. Will determine how many seasons of regrowth it needs. Depends on intensity. Range person and the Ranger would make that decision.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - What seems to weigh into this? All these folks that I've worked for have jobs and lives. One of these things that we never address in this plan is that these guys have lives, and it's impossible to keep up with these huge documents. How does anybody keep up with it? The employee thing? Make the plan to say something to encourage people to stay around for a while. Put in the plan some continuity so we can create some relationships. Go back to local decision making. That's what this has to always be. That should always be in the plan. My blood pressure goes out the top when I see sage grouse in this thing. You don't have enough sage grouse habitat in the forest to spit on. The plan has to enable things to start happening – instead of being restricting.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - But we are still taking comments and taking ideas in for the EIS? Yes. I am glad to hear that. I am encouraged by your willingness to make changes. And there is flexibility in the site-specific projects. I wonder who makes the decision on what and who the scientists are. There is some science done to create a bias. Who decides who you hire for those studies? We've run into that

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

before; agencies taking science from studies 20 years ago, and there have been more recent studies that dispute it.

- FS - I'm concerned that the utilization of 25% in bull trout isn't congruent with the regulatory agencies. I think the other standards/guidelines; we meet them for the most part. If anything goes wrong, it's Ben's fault.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - Referring to monitoring, my concern is that on some of the drier creeks later in the season is that they never even reach that stubble height. Is that going to be the hard line in the new plan? Over-grazing is about timing and duration of grazing. Utilization should be measured at the end of season, so that any regrowth is given consideration.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - I've received a letter saying that I could use closed roads, which I see as a potential for real conflict. Access shouldn't be my privilege; it should be our right to travel there.
- WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT - I don't even know where this Plan is. How long has this plan has been out? I hear everyone talk about accelerated restoration. Where will the credit I get for 50 years of work be written? Long time ago there were no woods on a certain creek we have. And I ask the forest service how much woods is enough? How many trees per foot per mile is enough? It's all apples and oranges on all these studies they are doing. How will the plan fix that?

Final thoughts around the circle. How do you feel the meeting went? Do you feel you were heard?

- Haven't read the Plan, so I haven't a clue. I think it's a great discussion.
- It was worth the drive. Someone commented earlier: We need to allow more flexibility on allotment on/off dates. Why do we need them? They bill solely on AUMs.
- Meeting was great. Appreciate you being here. I haven't read the whole plan. We can do a better job of clarifying where exactly to look for what in the document.
- I'm glad we had this meeting. I am encouraged by this meeting.
- I'm impressed with the passion permittees have for the land.
- I think this is a good meeting if these people have been heard, and if something can be incorporated.
- I thought it was a good meeting. I like a lot of what was said and what was planned, and I hope I can see some results and a lot of it happen.
- I think it was a real good meeting. I do have standing in the plan, and I am going to make sure your comments are heard in the plan.
- Maura did a great job. I learned a lot tonight. I feel pretty comfortable, and I like a lot of the ideas.
- I'm really glad that you guys had us all down here.
- I wasn't sure if I was going to come, but I am glad that I came. I need to look at the Plan more.
- I'm not going to read it. I'm tired of reading. I'm glad I came. I've come to hundreds of these things, and I'm counting on better employees to help me out.
- Good meeting. We all need to work together. Most people won't make a comment; they will let it go by the wayside. We need to all share our comments and make sure something comes out that will work for everyone.
- Thank you to the High Desert Partnership for holding this meeting. The model the High Desert Partnership used with the Refuge CCP worked well with meetings like this. It would be nice to delve deeper over next set of meetings.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- I thought it was really interesting. I gained a lot of knowledge. I wonder who the politicians are who will have the final approval of the plan.
- I think it was a good meeting. I didn't know what I was getting into. I didn't know where it was going. I think there are terrific ideas. The government needs to try and stop micromanaging. It is our livelihood, and it's important to us how it's done. Our comments aren't taken to heart and maybe they can't be. If you can get a group together to get input from and use, then it shouldn't be a waste.
- I thought it was a good meeting. Information going into the meeting from all points of view here. It's my livelihood; it's what I do, and everything I can get put in helps me out.
- I thought it was a good meeting. I am kind of encouraged like maybe I am being listened to, but in the end game, I'm not sure how much your influence is going to make a difference.
- I want to thank High Desert Partnership and the Harney County Court for getting this happening. This is the biggest turnout in the last two years, and that encourages me because it shows that people care. Thank you, Maura, for being so open and honest.
- Good meeting; the turnout was awesome.
- It's a good session. It would be nice to capture a base template people can use, because this plan has been going on for how long? How much other stuff could we have been doing in the meantime?
- I thought it was a good meeting; productive meeting; I'm encouraged. Glad the 25% will not be instituted.
- I think it was a very positive meeting. I'm retired; my background human services. Where has this process been?
- I thought it was a very good meeting. The statements that Steve Grasty made I think was one of the best things. We have to have roots to make sound decisions. Have people put roots down, and then they can finish the program.
- Good, well rounded meeting. I'm going to be kind of cynical. I've been to a lot of good meetings but not a bleeping thing has happened. Until we get local decision-making about grass from our local offices, nothing is going to happen.
- I think it was a good meeting. I've been in the Rattlesnake Creek for 26 years. I hope the changes that are made are changes for the good. If we look around the room, there are no young people here. How do we incorporate young people? How do we get them involved?
- I'd like to thank all the people that are spokesmen for us when we are not able to be here. I really appreciate that.
- FS - I heard a lot of confirmation. I didn't hear anything that isn't implementable. When it comes to how we hire people, I don't know how to address that in the Forest Plan. But everything else, I think we can get it done.