

HARNEY COUNTY HISTORY PROJECT

AV-Oral History #353 - Sides A/B/C/D/E

Subject: U. S. Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt

Meeting With OWIC

Place: Desert Theater - Burns, Oregon

Date: February 16, 1994

Moderator: Bill Pieratt

(Transcript made from BLM video.)

BILL PIERATT: ... and I'm enjoying your community here today. We're going to have a few introductions to start with, and first of all with some words of welcome I'd like to introduce Harney County Judge Dale White.

DALE WHITE: Good afternoon everyone. Congressman Smith, Secretary Babbitt, Assistant Secretary Armstrong, Acting BLM Director Dombeck, Oregon State BLM Director Bibles, member of OWIC, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to welcome you to Harney County, where the issues you address are not an academic exercise, but are real life and death decisions for the 7,000 residents of our county. Harney County is the 9th largest county in the Continental United States, and the largest county in Oregon. Harney County is composed of 10,228 square miles, or 6,545,000 of which approximately 4,103,000 acres is BLM land, 516,000 acres are Forest Service land, and 183,000 acres is Refuge land, or a total of over 4,803,000 acres in federal ownership. In addition, the State of Oregon owns over 200,000 acres, which leaves only a 1,583,000 acres of private land to pay for the operation of county services. Harney County is a resource dependent county, and has an economic base that is founded on the ranching and timber industries. The timber industry is almost 100% dependent on the Forest Service for our log supply, and our ranchers are dependent on the Forest Service, BLM, and Refuge lands for grazing for our

cattle herds for six or seven months of every year. The massive federal ownership of nearly 5,000,000 acres of our county's land area severely limits our ability to raise revenue for vital public services. In addition, the county is expected to provide the infrastructure and support that are necessary to permit the use of these vast areas of public lands for the so-called national ownership interest. Secretary Babbitt, we applaud and appreciate the concern for the wise use of these lands that has brought you to Burns to bring all the competing interests for our public lands together to engage in a discussion that will hopefully result in developing a process where reasonable people can agree on how we're going to address, and solve the problems that so easily divide us, and result in destructive accusation, and counter accusations and that do little to resolve the issues we all want resolved in a responsible manner. I am disappointed that county government is not more involved in the process, because no matter which decision is reached, counties are essential to provide the services that permit access to, and use of these lands.

Enough of the serious stuff. I'd like to share a couple stories with you regarding communication and cooperation. Seems that two friends were out hiking on our public lands and met an aggressive bear that apparently was in need of lunch. The two friends started running, but it soon became evident that the bear was gaining on them. One of the individuals sat down, took off his shoes, took off his clothes, took his running shoes and his running shorts out of his knapsack and put them on. And his friend said, "What are you doing, you know you can't out run that bear?" He turned to his ex-friend and said, "I know that, but I don't have to outrun the bear, all I have to do is outrun you." Now that is communication, hardly cooperation. The bear is gaining on all public land users, and we can gamble on sacrificing our friends and hope we survive, or we can communicate and cooperate and all survive.

Another story, the old blacksmith took a young man into his business and told him he would teach the trade. The blacksmith took his tongs, pulled the horseshoe out of the forge, and laid it on the anvil and handed the young man a big old hammer and said, "When I nod my head, hit it with a hammer." That poor guy is six feet under the sod because he could not communicate. It's very, very important.

The challenge, the opportunity is for communication and cooperation process to start here today. If we do, I believe these magnificent lands are big enough to accommodate all of us.

Welcome to Harney County, and good luck in your meeting. (Applause)

Bruce Babbitt became the 47th Secretary of the Interior on January the 22nd, 1993. He was Governor of the State of Arizona for nine years from 1978 to 1987, and Attorney General of Arizona from 1975 to 1978. Born June 27th, 1938 Babbitt grew up in Flagstaff, Arizona where his family pioneered a ranching and trading business. After graduation from the University of Notre Dame where he was student body president, he won a marshal scholar to the University of New Castle where he received a master's degree in geophysics. He then completed his education with a law degree from Harvard Law School in 1965. Babbitt, who was in the private practice of law at the time of his nomination to the Secretary of the Interior, also he was the president of the non-profit, non-partisan league of conservation voters. Described by the Almanac of American Politics as one of America's most original governors, his advocacy led to passage of a nationally acclaimed state water management code in 1980, and a landmark water quality act in 1986. I've had the opportunity of meeting Secretary Babbitt only once before today, so I hardly know him personally, but I do have good friends in county government in Arizona like Pete Shumway, Percy Deil, and Larry Laton who are good friends of Secretary Babbitt, and has shared with me the high esteem that they hold for this man personally, and politically, and professionally. They tell me that despite being an attorney, Secretary Babbitt has a strong conviction that the best way to solve controversial issues is for the parties involved to sit down and work things out instead of fighting them out in the courtroom. I am ... that despite being an attorney, Secretary Babbitt has a unique ability to bring divergent groups together and work out a solution that all can agree to. That he has the courage to attack difficult and emotional issues and stick with them until consensus is achieved. Please join me in welcoming a man who has cared enough to come to Burns to address the difficult issues confronting users of public lands. Ladies and gentlemen, a warm welcome to Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt. (Applause)

BRUCE BABBITT: They told me I was talking last. Let me just say that I'm delighted to be here.

And I just want to underscore what the Judge said in his introduction. I'm here searching for some areas of consensus, because I believe we can find them. This process is, has got to involve a lot of people at the grassroots level. We're going to continue it until we either find some consensus, or exhaust everyone in the process. Now, let me just say that after we leave here today, and visit in our final round of western stops, we will be issuing preliminary draft regulations in early March. But, I would emphasize that after that, there will be another round of discussion of looking for better ways to do things, and trying to work out the rules and regulations for something that affects your lives so directly.

Let me just say prior to the point that the discussion begins, that I've had a lot of questions about the Colorado Model which has been the subject of some discussion before the Society for Range Professionals and others. That's going to be a part of the draft proposal, but it's not a mandatory part of all of this. And I'm especially eager to hear about the Eastern Oregon experience. Because as I see it, we want to have a set of proposals that are wide enough, and broad enough to encompass these kinds of working groups. In all of their diversity, I'm especially eager to hear about the successes that you've had in Eastern Oregon. Because from my trip to Baker, from the time that I've spent thinking and talking with so many of you, it's clear to me that for all of the differences, and all the apprehension, and all the attention, that in fact if there were one place in all of the west where I see these models emerging most strongly, it would certainly be in Eastern Oregon. You're a long way ahead of the thinking in much of the rest of the West. And as I read at the start of this meeting, the letter that I've had from the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, as I listen to Doc and Connie Hatfield, and so many others, I really sense that we are on a convergent path, and that the differences between the approach that we are now going to take, and the experience that you have been accumulating here, really are not that wide. And that just maybe, if we talk and communicate, and listen to each other, and air our differences, and sort of try to find that consensus, that we may emerge from the other side of this a lot closer than either you or I might have anticipated a year ago.

So it's in that spirit that I come here to listen. And the reason that I was so taken aback, as I

promised myself when I came in that I wasn't going to talk. And so I'm going to go back, and I'm going to sit and listen. Thank you. (Applause)

DALE WHITE: Now in his sixth term as a member of the United States House of Representatives, Congressman Bob Smith enjoys the experience of nearly three decades of Oregon's public service. In 1960, he was first elected to the Oregon House of Representatives and served in that body until 1973, including four years as speaker of the house. In 1973, Bob was elected to the Oregon Senate, and four years later was selected as the Senate Republican Leader, and so served until his election to Congress in 1982. Oregon's second congressional district, which Smith represents, is one of the nation's largest, covering 20 of Oregon's 36 counties, including all of Oregon east of the summit of the Cascades, as well as 2 counties west of the Cascades in Southern Oregon. This huge district, which is 75% owned by the federal government, has given Congressman Smith unique insights regarding the critical issues we are now facing in public land management. Bob holds influential positions on the House Agriculture Committee and the House Committee on Natural Resources. With jurisdiction over the U. S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, these committees afford him the opportunity to impact decisions that affect the livelihood of the residents of his district.

A son of a frontier physician and nurse who practiced medicine in Harney County, Smith maintains a deep affection for rural American life, which he is committed to preserving. A cattle rancher by profession and outdoorsman by avocation, he has respect for the land and the opportunities its resources afford. Smith believes that environmental protection should be sensibly balanced with the needs for jobs, roads, schools, and public services that these lands make possible.

As most of you know, Bob has decided to retire from Congress at the end of this term, and I may never be able to introduce a Congressman like him again. It's my pleasure to introduce my friend, my classmate, a man uniquely qualified to address how to best manage our public lands in a wise multiple use concept. Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in welcoming one of our very own, Congressman Bob Smith. (Applause)

BOB SMITH: Thank you kindly, Dale. Now I know why I was the best man at your wedding. I

enjoyed that, and it stuck, and I'm proud of that. Thank you for the very warm welcome ladies and gentlemen. And I was visiting with the Secretary backstage a minute ago. This is kind of familiar territory for me. I believe I was three years old, that's at least when I can remember, coming into this theater, called the Ideal, watching Hopalong Cassidy on this screen. So I go back, that's twenty or thirty years ago. (Laughter)

Well, first I want to welcome the Secretary to cow country. Burns is the county seat of Harney County, as we know. It was settled before the turn of the century by cattle ranchers. Harney County is the 9th largest county in the United States, Mr. Secretary, and we often joke, comprised of 7,000 people and 100,000 cows, that's not a joke. Over 75% of Harney County, and 75% of all of the second congressional district in Oregon, is owned and managed and controlled by the federal government, be it the Forest Service, the BLM, the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Bird Refuges. And that's the very reason that many of our communities, like ours in the West, will live or die economically upon the decisions that you will make shortly.

Burns was named for the Scotch bard and poet Robert Burns. Following the Scotch tradition, this community is frugal, fiercely independent, and demands little from its federal government other than the freedom to raise our families, cherish our neighbors, protect the land, and contribute to the cheap food policy from which all Americans benefit.

I am here to commend you, Mr. Secretary, for taking your time to share with us your thoughts, and we, our thoughts to you, about this most important issue in the West. One of the primary reasons the administration's first rangeland reform package failed was that it gave too much authority to the bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., and not enough flexibility to range managers in places like Burns, Oregon and others. This is why these meetings are so important. We need to find a process to empower communities like Burns, and others, so that we can avoid another bruising battle on range reform issues as we had recently in the nation's capital, only last fall. I know you will recall vividly, Mr. Secretary, the filibuster in the United States Senate, which defeated Senator Reed from Nevada's so called compromise of a fee of \$3.45 for AUM. And a rangeland reform package which I understand you supported, which placed in jeopardy issues like

water rights, tenure, and advisory committees among others. The Senate, upon defeating Senator Reed's proposal, then passed a moratorium on grazing fees that was sent to the House. The House didn't act on it. So Mr. Secretary, you lost in the Senate, and I lost in the House. So maybe this is a good place to begin.

I want to make sure that, and you have mentioned that you have read the Oregon Cattlemen's Association plan, and I commend it to you. They need time to put it in place. But it seems to me the twin goals of sustainable livestock industry and ecological protection are not mutually exclusive. Let me say that again. The twin goals of sustainable livestock industry, and ecological protection, are not mutually exclusive. The BLM has found that 81% of the rangeland in Oregon is in fair or excellent condition. One thing is clear, Oregon ranchers are good stewards of the land, but they can be better.

If federal land management is to succeed, it's in my opinion the following goals must be met. Measurable management objectives, continued good stewardship, sustainable commodity production, healthy communities, and viable rural economics, protection of private property rights, recognition of economic and ecological values, recognition of the interdependence between private, state, and federal lands. Opportunities for decision making by permittees and local governments. The last goal of the system that allows local control can only be achieved by decentralizing the approach to range management. I believe that national direction can only evolve reasonably from resource goals developed at a local level. And of course, to charge a fee which is fair and reasonable. Never was this more evident to me than when I began working on the Newberry Crater National Volcanic Monument. It's a monument outside Bend, Oregon, and a group of people 22 strong, I believe, worked for two years, environmentalists, private groups, commercial interests, and put together a plan to establish the boundaries of the Newberry Crater Monument. It was a model, I believe, of bringing people locally together with diverse interests, producing a conclusion that satisfied everybody. That ought to be done with range management. The Oregon Watershed Improvement Coalition is another example of how members of differing viewpoints can work together to develop programs that benefit both commodity users and the environment. While I look

forward to the presentations today, as well as the conclusions of the Colorado working group. And just a reminder Mr. Secretary, this industry is not without friends. In fact, the filibuster in the Senate, if there is a draconian move on the livestock industry in America, the filibuster is still alive. So that we do have friends in high places. And I must point out that the Reagan and Bush administrations would have vetoed any increase in grazing fees. The Clinton administration and you, Mr. Secretary, are interested in increasing grazing fees. The reason I point this out is if the Bush and Reagan administrations had brought the Reed plan to the Senate, there would have been a filibuster as well. So it's a non-partisan issue. The point remains (laughter) (applause) the point remains this industry is willing to move. This industry is on the move. We want to improve our managerial strengths on the land, and we've shown that through the Colorado group, through this Oregon very progressive program. We'd like to have a chance to make it work, Mr. Secretary, please let us make it work. Thank you. (Applause)

BILL PIERATT: Thank you gentlemen for your wisdom and introductory remarks. I'm going to give you a brief overview of the agenda this afternoon. I'll talk a little bit about some ground rules and some housekeeping details, and then we'll begin with the first major segment of our agenda. First of all, I'd like to recognize and thank the Elks Club in this community. For those of you that are strangers in this community it's just across the street, and they have opened their doors for any overflow audience. There is a large screen TV on the stage over there, and this proceedings here is being broadcast to the rest of our audience across the street. And I think that it would be appropriate to recognize the Elks Club for their support in this event.

Our agenda is relatively simple; it really consists of two parts. We're going to have a group discussion with the Secretary, among the members that you see before you. These folks, with a few guests, are members of the Oregon Watershed Improvement Coalition. And they're going to be discussing around the objective or the purpose of conveying the Oregon Watershed Improvement Coalition experience that group; a group of folks with diverse interests can find common ground that leads to positive change on the land. And that's really in line with some of the things that we have heard mentioned already today.

Now for those of you who aren't familiar with this building, the rest room is in the back, there is a concession back there that has the coffee, I believe soft drinks, and maybe some rolls or donuts. I was told by the owner of the building that the proceeds from any sales back there are going to help renovate this building, since it is a historic building. So you feel free during the course of our discussion, if you want to take advantage of that concession, to please do so.

Now one other administrative detail I guess, we have, or will in the next few minutes, pass out both here and in the Elks Club a clipboard to give you an opportunity to sign up, register the fact that you were here. We're happy, first of all that you're here, we'd like to know who you are, what interest you represent. Oregon Watershed Improvement Coalition can use your registration to develop a mailing list if they have information that they'd like to send out. So please, when that clipboard comes around, register your attendance by signing name, address. I have not seen the registration form, so I don't know exactly what's on it. Another thing that we either have, or will be distributing, are 3 x 5 cards. Now this has to do with the second part of our agenda where you all are going to have a chance to participate. And that may well be why a lot of you came. And I'll describe, those cards, and we're using a different colored card for the Elks Club so we can tell we've got a little different logistics problem. We're going to, for anyone in the audience who wants to make a statement, write your name on that card and hand it to one of the ushers in either aisle. You don't need to write down the nature of your statement or anything like that, just your name. We're going to put them in a squirrel cage up here, and we're going to let the odds take care of themselves, and we're going to randomly draw from the supply of cards. And anyone who is wanting to make a statement in the second portion, which is an hour long, will be given two minutes to do that.

Another opportunity is to ask questions, either of the Secretary or of other members of our group here about consensus processes or whatever. Now just write your name on that card, you don't have to write the question down. But if you'd like me to read the question, and not get up and ask it yourself, write the question on the card, and if I draw that card out I'll be happy to read the question for you.

Now we have two microphones, one in each aisle, and as we draw cards we're going to call

names and you can make your way to the microphone. As I call your name a second time, or the speaker preceding you is finished, and you can make your statement or ask your question. And then you can just return to your seat. Those cards for folks that are in the Elks Club, we'll notify them that their card has been drawn, they'll be brought over here, and they'll do the same sort of thing.

So again, you can make a statement, you're going to be confined to two minutes, and I'm going to try as hard as I can to see that that goes that way. So, if you see me stand up, you're at one of the mikes, and I'm signaling that your two minutes is up, please respectfully end your statement and go back to your seat. And that way we will give the maximum opportunity to folks to participate that's available. I think that's probably enough housekeeping and ground rules and so forth, so I'd like to move on. Some of you are aware of the Oregon Watershed Improvement Coalition and some of its activities, and perhaps some of you are not. So for those that are not familiar, we've asked Mary Hanson, who is a member of the Watershed Improvement Coalition, to give a brief overview of OWIC and its purposes. So Mary ---

MARY HANSON: Hi, I'm real happy to be here. I've recently moved away from Burns, and it's kind of nice to come back and visit with all the friends that I have here. OWIC was started in 1986, some folks in the Pacific Northwest Section of the Society for Range Management were thinking about what a neat idea it would be to bring some pretty typical adversarial folks together, or folks that represented differing views, bring them together and see what would happen, since this is obviously something that wasn't taking place. So they asked some folks in the Cattlemen's Association, and some of the environmental groups in Oregon, to come to the table and see if we could in fact have some constructive dialog. Those first meetings involved folks from the Society for Range Management, the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, the Oregon Environmental Council, Oregon Trout, and the Oregon Natural Resources Council, excuse me also the Isaac Walton League of America. The discussions that we had in those early meetings were very fruitful, and it became apparent that some other folks should also be invited. So in addition to those folks, and subsequently as for instance ONRC has dropped out, we have added the Oregon Forest Industries Council, the Oregon Small Woodlands Association, the Nature Conservancy, and the Oregon

Chapter of the Sierra Club. One of the first things that occurred during these discussions was to see if we couldn't come together on a common goal that we all could agree on. And we did that, and that goal has remained virtually unchanged, and that is that we wish to insure the long-term sustainability of Oregon's watersheds, and to improve communications among the diverse interests that affect watershed management.

I need to say a few words about how OWIC functions. One of the things we decided very early on is that we wanted to spend the bulk of our time talking about the issues, and trying to reach consensus. So we have virtually no bureaucracy. We are very unorganized, very loosely organized. I should say, we basically meet on, about every other month, and we have one person who acts as meeting chairman, and that's it. There are no officers. The chairman does take notes, and has his secretary type them up. We maintain a mailing list of approximately 175 people, so folks that are interested in what OWIC is doing, by merely asking to be on the mailing list, can receive all of the copies of all of the minutes and things that go on during the meeting. Since we are not a bureaucracy, we generally have meetings that are just the group. We do respond to requests to sit in on the meetings. But we felt that to have really effective communication that it needed to be taking place in a ... limited atmosphere where we could be frank and where we were not concerned about, sort of a larger public listening. We view ourselves as facilitators, not mediators. The goal is to try to find a common ground to communicate. Basically, what we want are healthy watersheds, and the only way to do that is to bring the different interests together to reach some common goals.

Some of the accomplishments as our role of facilitators we've worked with some other groups who heard about OWIC, and heard how we could talk to one another and come to some agreement on things. And they asked us to come and help them out in certain areas, and so we helped form the Trout Creek working group down at Trout Creeks, which most of you folks in Harney County know about, but a lot of other folks don't. That group has been very successful in attaining some positive changes on the land where we have a threatened Lahontan cutthroat trout, and we have managed to also maintain grazing systems. So that's a very positive effort that OWIC had a lot to do with. There is also a Central Oregon land issues forum working group out of the

Brothers area, that are working on development of some coordinated resource management plans for some very large blocks of land in Central Oregon.

We also went into the Bridge Creek watershed near Mitchell, and we, actually we had thought about it as being a demonstration area because we thought that in our dialogue that we could come up with some very functional objectives and goals, but if we didn't apply that to the ground then we virtually didn't have anything to show for ourselves. So, we got some folks together in Bridge Creek and asked if they wouldn't let us try to do a demonstration area in their watershed. And some folks came forward and said, "Yes, we'd like you to help us, tell us what's going on here, what do we need to do, how can we make it better." And so the Bridge Creek working group became a being. And those folks have really jelled as a group; everybody in the watershed knows, has that concept of the total watershed, is aware of how watershed functions. And they're working with their management systems to improve their watersheds. Probably one of the most important things that we did was that we produced these two brochures that have had very, very wide distribution all over the six western states. The first one we did was "Riparian Areas, Their Benefits and Uses", it showed some before and afters, and I think what's really important here is that this was a collaborative effort between those folks on the coalition. We all agreed that this was what we wanted to say, and we provided, produced a product that has all of our support on it. That one was very successful, we decided that we needed to tell people what a watershed was, how watershed functions. And so we produced the other brochure, which was called, "Watersheds, Their Importance and Functions." And these brochures keep popping up all over the place. We're into our fourth printing and we still get requests for them. So I don't have anything else to say about the history. That gives you a flavor for OWIC.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you, Mary. Why I think it's time that we meet the members of the group, and then we'll proceed on. We have, well, we have, I am not a member of OWIC, I have attended a few of their meetings. And I have an interesting introduction procedure that we're going to dispense with today, just in the interest of time, but generally they introduce themselves in terms of their name, and they talk about what they hope to help happen that day, or how they're feeling about

being at the meeting, dealing with the agenda. And it really brings some insight into what's going on inside people's minds and hearts as they're at that meeting. So we're just going to briefly introduce ourselves so that you know who we all are, and then we'll proceed. And Kathy let's start with you.

KATHY FERGE: Hi, I'm Kathy Ferge and I'm from Echo, Oregon, and I'm publicist for the group.

FRED OTLEY: I'm Fred Otley, rancher from Diamond, Oregon, member of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association.

DOC HATFIELD: I'm Doc Hatfield a rancher from Brothers, Oregon, the Oregon Cattlemen.

DAVID MOSKOWITZ: My name is David Moskowitz, I'm from Portland, Oregon, and I'm with Oregon Trout.

CHAD BACON: Chad Bacon with the Society for Range Management.

LEW CURTIS: I'm Lew Curtis, and I'm with the Oregon Chapter of the Sierra Club.

IRENE VLACH: Irene Vlach, Sierra Club.

JOHN MONFORE: John Monfore with the Oregon Forest Industries Council.

KEN BENTZ: Ken Bentz, Drewsey, Oregon, Oregon Cattlemen's Association.

WAYNE ELMORE: I'm Wayne Elmore from Prineville, Oregon, with the Society for Range Management.

LEWIS RANDALL: I'm Lew Randall from Bonanza, Oregon, Oregon Cattlemen's Association.

MARY HANSON: Mary Hanson from LaGrande, Oregon, Oregon Environmental Council.

RICK ROSS: Rick Ross, Sherwood, Oregon, Society for Range Management.

CHUCK GRAHAM: I'm Chuck Graham, Forest Supervisor on the Fremont National Forest, and also District Manager for the Lakeview BLM District.

DEAN BIBLES: I'm Dean Bibles, BLM State Director for Washington and Oregon.

MIKE DOMBECK: I'm Mike Dombeck; I'm Acting Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

BOB ARMSTRONG: I'm Bob Armstrong; I'm Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, which among others, has the BLM under my jurisdiction.

BRUCE BABBITT: I'm still Bruce Babbitt.

CAL COLE: I'm Cal Cole, from Portland, Oregon Trout.

BILL OBERTEUFFER: I'm Bill Oberteuffer from Elgin, Oregon, Small Woodlands Association.

MONTY MONTGOMERY: Monty Montgomery, Portland, Oregon, Oregon Division Isaac Walton League.

BOB SKINNER: Bob Skinner, Jordan Valley, Oregon Cattlemen's Association.

ELLEN BISHOP: Ellen Bishop, Union, Oregon, Pacific Rivers Council.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you very much. One other piece of business that we want to get out of the way before we get involved in a discussion interchange is that, in addition to the summary that Mary gave us about who OWIC is, and what the Watershed Improvement Coalition does, they have a vision about their activities and a vision for the future. And one of the group members, Doc Hatfield, is going to share that with us, Doc.

DOC HATFIELD: Thank you. It's real simple, the kind of vision that OWIC has, accomplishing it is the thing that's difficult. Basically, the concept is that a group of concerned diverse people working together can find common ground that makes positive change on the land on a watershed basis possible. And that sounds kind of wimpy, and mamby pamby, and who cares, and it's, why are you doing that? And so I want to get into a little bit of how hard this is for diverse people to work together. It's real easy to join people together to fight something. It's not easy at all to get people together who view the world from a different viewpoint and find common ground. And I want to tell just a little personal story that kind of shows how my thinking changed, and even though it has changed, and the thinking of most, well, the thinking of everyone in OWIC has changed, it's not easy.

About 1982 or '83, Denzel Ferguson wrote the book, "The Sacred Cows at Public Trough". And my wife Connie and I wrote an editorial in the Sunday Oregonian and said we thought things weren't like that, and we invited any environmental group that was concerned to come to our ranch, and we'd like to show them. And of course, our view was that we owned a, the --- when we bought our ranch, along with it, about a quarter of our capacity was based on a legally adjudicated grazing preference on some public land, which we considered a part of our operation. We thought we were

doing a good job. So, in a typical rancher viewpoint, we thought we'll get them out here, and we'll educate them. We'll tell them how it is, then they'll know, then they'll go away and leave us alone. And that's what education is all about. We know, we tell you, then you know, then you go away and everything is fine. Simple, huh?

So we invited them, and the Isaac Walton League came, which is Monty Montgomery's group. And we were pretty doggone nervous, and Connie, my wife, tells it better, I don't have time. But we really were expecting some pretty strange folks to come. (Laughter) Well, it turned out that they were reasonably nice people, they viewed the world different from us, but they pointed out a few things that we hadn't seen. Kind of like, how come aren't there willows growing along these creeks where cows are, when where the cows aren't, there are no willows. How come is that? Well, hmm, must be the creeks changes in that interim, and things like that. Anyway, even after being a member of the Isaac Walton League and going on their tours, I still had that concept, I know, I'll tell them eventually, then they'll know, and they'll still go away. I realized that cows could eat willows, and probably they shouldn't. So we went on a tour with the Ikes on a, and Bill Pieratt was along, and we went out on a place where there had been no grazing and everybody was saying how neat that looked, and I stood up in a big voice and I said, "You know you environmental folks are phony as a three dollar bill. All you do is moan and complain and file lawsuits. Show me where you have ever improved one acre of land anywhere, ever." And it got kind of quiet like it did now, because I've told that story a hundred times, and it always gets quiet. And one of the Ikes stood up and said, "Well, gosh, Doc," he said, "I thought you understood," he said, "we haven't worked on the land because we don't have any land to manage." He said, "Ranchers manage land, the BLM manages land, the Forest Service manages land; the only way we can affect what happens on the land is by our input into the laws that govern how the land is managed." And I thought, gosh, I wonder why I didn't think about that.

And if you think, how would you feel if you were a big city environmentalist and you were really concerned about the future of the earth and the future of the land, and you saw cattle management that isn't up to par. And we have lots of management in Oregon that's very good, and

we have lots of management in Oregon that's not very good. And if you were in Portland and worried about that, and all you could affect it by is through the law that would be a frustrating thing, and no wonder you would be a little chapped part of the time.

So, the solution obviously was to get, have people get together and build a common vision for what the land could be, and then work to accomplish it. And that's kind of where OWIC is coming from, and I hope I didn't insult anybody in either the livestock side or the environmental side. But the fact that the environmental side only has the law, and the ranch side is the side that works on the land, makes it very hard to communicate. But once you can get this community of interest together, the big city environmentalists, and we invite them to our place, and it's different if you invite them and say, "Hey, what would this land be like if we could have it as good as it could be? What are the needs of the land, and then the ranchers and the agencies work to accomplish those goals that we set in common." And working together then, that allows a consensus force that is quite a bit stronger than Bruce Babbitt in making things happen.

If the group on this table, and their organizations agree on something, it will happen. Because that's consensus, and that's support of a diverse group, and that's kind of what politics is about. You get enough diverse people together, and if those diverse people are working for the good of the land, it will occur. And that's what we're trying to do with OWIC, and that's what we hope that the new range reform will encourage and allow to continue. Because in Oregon, Mr. Secretary, we'd like the land to get as good as it can be, and we'd like to help make that happen. Thanks. (Applause)

BILL PIERATT: Thank you, Doc. Well, now you have met all the players, you've heard some viewpoints, you've heard some expectations, and for the next 45 minutes or so, we're going to give these folks an opportunity to talk to one another while you all listen and watch. I would encourage you to listen closely. If something someone says sparks a question that you might want to ask, please write it down on that card. If it brings up a subject that you would like to make a statement, that's what that card is for also. So, we'll give these folks a while to talk to one another, and then your turn will come to participate.

And I'm going to be honest with you, and I don't want to set the members of our group that are going to be in this discussion ill at ease, but just how do you plan for a conversation. Who is going to start, what are you going to talk about, and how is it going to go with a 150 or 300 people watching you, while you're sitting up here trying to get some points made. So, we're just going to sit down and watch it happen. The floor is yours, go for it.

CAL COLE: Well I'm Cal Cole, and as you well know, the members of OWIC know I'm not particularly bashful. One of the processes that I have, one that I have been concerned about, and in a long time, is we had a working group that worked as a group of community of interest people that were concerned in the Trout Creeks. And we think we've got a plan that will work. I say I think, because you know, ten years, twenty years from now, we may know if it works. But it looks like it will, but we got to keep working on it. And whatever set of regs are developed, Colorado group, design ring, whatever, one of the questions they've got, is how does a group like, a question of mine, how does a group like that, like the Trout Creek working group, mesh in with, you know, multiple use grazing, multiple use advisory panels I guess, or whatever that's called. And that's --- and we want to make sure that continues. And so, one of the things that we've talked about, and I present, and I ask any member of OWIC to work on this, is we've labored with this question. And what we've done at Trout Creek, and what we've done at Bridge Creek is really just get people together.

OWIC in itself, we really haven't done anything other than get people together and to talk about, try to come up with some answers. Now how do we export this out? This is a question we keep asking ourselves and we're still asking it, and I think maybe one of the nice things that may come out of the new proposal, very frankly, is push OWIC, push us enough to sit down and figure out how do we teach, how do we get this beyond ourselves. We can talk among ourselves, we can get a little bit done, but there is what 1100 allotments in the State of Oregon, and it took three years to do the White Horse Buttes allotment. We can't spend three years on 1100 allotments, we've got to figure out to export a way that we deal, that we work with people and got there. But we got to figure out how to teach other people to do it and get on with it. So if anybody in OWIC has got any

ideas I'm willing to, you know, let's jot them down and get on with them. And how we export this, this, whatever it is we did out.

JOHN MONFORE: Well, I think that if we look at OWIC as a process where people coming together to affect positive things on the land, we've seen that work Cal, and we know that it can work in other areas. But it has to install a continuous improvement process, and one that's reliable. And it's people that are both close to the ground, and that are managing the ground, and that have livestock or other interests that will make it work. But it can't exclude the whole interest community. The community that's interested and that will take part and enter into dialogue and work together, that's the group that will make things happen positively on the ground. Without that, you end up in a real polarized camp, just like Doc was talking about initially. But it's that community of interest that will work together.

And boy, I'm dealing with that in spades in my own business right now in the grazing program and the forest products business. So, it's a very real process, not only through OWIC, but professionally. And we've all seen it work, but it's a matter of getting that established on a smaller basis. People who want to work together, not who are appointed, but who will want to reach positive improvements on the ground.

BOB SKINNER: Cal, on regard to your first comment about how do we get beyond ourselves and to other groups, I think that the OWIC process actually takes care of a lot of what the problems that the multiple use council, they're going to have a lot of that ironed out, because you've got the people that are there interested, and we're going to have a lot of those problems already settled when it goes to the multiple use council. And I think if we can communicate, I'm like you, I think we have a real challenge to get this message across. But, I think if we can get those people that are on the ground to settle their problems first, it's going to eliminate a lot of the decision-making problems that the manager is going to have to face in the end.

DAVID MOSKOWITZ: Mr. Secretary, Dave Moskowitz from Oregon Trout, one of the questions we were going to hear from the members of the Colorado group, and that did not happen. One of the questions we do have is how, given the Interior statement that, perhaps word for word, the

Colorado proposal is going to be adopted, how OWIC fits in, and I think that's a little bit of what we're dancing around right now. And we're all real curious to hear from you how we fit in.

Because things are different here in Oregon.

BRUCE BABBITT: Well, let me see if I can just sort of sketch briefly how we see it as of this particular day in February of this year out on the ground. What I'm hearing from all of you is exactly the direction we want to go. And I just want to say at the outset that the kinds of things that all of you have just said, everyone of you, that this process you've learned to work, ground level, diverse representation, the search for consensus, is exactly what we want to try to move toward. This language is not yet spoken in most of the West, and that is to me the great importance of this.

Now the question is, how do you do it? How do you encourage this kind of grassroots, diverse local process? We've bought into that because what I've heard over the last six months is, and what I agree with is, you can't do it from Washington, you can't prescriptively write rules and regulations from on high. And therefore we must go out, local watersheds, local areas, and try to see if we can put together a structure which is, encourages and is responsive to, and listens to, and takes guidance from the kinds of things that you have done at Trout Creek Mountain, at Bridge Creek, and elsewhere.

Now here's the direction that we're thinking about. First of all, the multiple-use councils are already there at the district level, and those will be continued because they are mandated by law. Those are multiple-use councils, and we're going to try to make sure that the representation is, in fact, diverse. But that's not where the action is; the action, in our judgment, is a lot closer to the landscape.

Now, the Colorado Model is an option, and it's advertised as that. The Colorado Model says if you want to organize a working group at the ground level, and if the local people want to buy into that, you can do it in an official way that relates upward to the district advisory council. And that gives you, gives that group some status under federal law to make recommendations with respect to the range improvement funds and that kind of thing. That Model may not be appropriate in Oregon or Arizona or New Mexico. It's for those who want to try it. Now it seems to me our

challenge is to say clearly to all of you, we're prepared to listen to any kind of group that comes up outside of the federal framework, the ones that are already operating that you've talked about. And to the extent that you are genuinely representative of the diverse groups, and are operating and generating consensus advise, my mandate to the Bureau of Land Management is going to be, that's fine. That's what local decision-making, and local control is all about, and we're hear to listen to you.

IRENE VLACH: I get a little bit nervous each time I hear local control and local decision-making, and I think a lot of OWIC people share this concern. That we prefer to hear community of interest, rather than local. Because we find it's imperative ... everybody who has an interest in the place gets to participate in the process, not only whoever happens to live on the ground.

BRUCE BABBITT: Yeah, if that's your definition of community of interest, I think our response is good; we're prepared to listen.

IRENE VLACH: A weak definition of community of interest is whoever has an interest in the land that is being dealt with, no matter where you reside.

BRUCE BABBITT: I accept that, I think that as we listen to working groups which spring up at the local level, that they must be genuinely representative. And the only question that I would ask, and that I would have Dombeck and Bibles and the BLM, the managers ask, is they'll have to make some kind of, just gut-level judgment about the fact that all the stake holders are at the table, sportsmen, wildlife people, local public officials, permit holders, and that kind of thing. But it seems to me to be as open as wide as the horizon, and it really ought to be.

KATHY FERGE: I think one of the other things that you see here represented in OWIC, is a lot of commitment, and the volunteering to take the time to work through the process, and as well as an interest in the consensus process. And that's one of the reasons that the group seems to get the job done. And it's something that we would like to see encouraged in some of the other groups.

BRUCE BABBITT: I'd like to ask all of you a question. And that is simply define consensus for me, as you understand it. Because I think it is tremendously important. I was asked on the way in, people said, "Well, if we have these local groups, doesn't that mean that the permit holders will be

outvoted if they are only, you know, one of the many stake holders represented." And my answer to that has been, I think that what I see on the landscape in Colorado, and Oregon, and Wyoming and some other places, is a different model which says that the advise to the managers is really only as good as the degree of consensus that's behind it. And it really isn't about getting half plus one; it's about buying in everybody. That if it's half plus one, well that's just the, you know, the disagreement continues, and ultimately the decision-making falls to the managers. What the managers want to hear, and what I want to hear, and what I want to hear from you is, can you really get all the stakeholders together? Have you managed to do it in real life? Because if you have, I want you to bottle that potion and let me carry it across the Western landscape. Because I'm absolutely convinced that we've got to bring the West together. And if you're doing it, we got to figure how to do it everywhere.

DAVE MOSKOWITZ: If I may just touch on a couple things to answer your first question, one of the definitions, the definition of consensus that we came to consensus on, actually, it came right out of one of those dictionaries, either Webster's or Macmillan, but it's a unanimous concurrence evidenced by lack of dissent. And everybody in the group felt pretty comfortable with that.

In terms of whether we have everyone, all the affected interests here at OWIC, it may be unclear. One of the reasons that perhaps not everybody is here sitting up on this side of the table, instead of that side of the barrister there, is that perhaps a confusion about what we're about. And I think that Doc and Mary laid out that pretty clearly that we're a forum where people and groups of diverse interests come together to reach decisions about what's best for the land. And one of the confusions, one of the difficulties we've had in operating with your, with the Interior's process, would be on its processes. That we feel there is a bit of a mixing of apples and oranges, in that we're combining the idea of working groups and consensus groups with scientifically based watershed level management. And that isn't necessarily just on federal lands, but through the whole watershed across all administrative boundaries. And so those, the fact that both of those concepts have been combined, caused many environmental groups for one, not to participate in OWIC, because they don't feel that that's the way to achieve one or the other, and there is a confusion there.

And I can't necessarily speak for other interests, or why they're not part of OWIC. So that's one reason why everyone's not here, and I don't know if we're quite ready to put it in a bottle and give it to you. But I've talked enough; I'm going to let some fellow folks speak.

JOHN MONFORE: I might have one thing to say on that, coming from the forest products business, that you look at a laminated beam, and the laminated beam is much stronger than any one of the individual pieces. In many cases, one plus one equals five instead of two. And there is a certain synergy when people are working together, and you can feel it in the group. You'll start out doing this mating dance and everybody expressing their opinion, but then pretty soon, when you start dealing with the issue on the ground, you start seeing that everybody can benefit. And rarely ever does the livestock, or the grazier, or the permittee not benefit from that down the road, long term, or even short term. But it's an educational thing as well as the synergy that comes from working together. When the land is improved, everybody benefits.

Now it takes a certain amount of trust, and you have to develop that; sometimes it takes a long time. Without that trust, you end up doing weird things like corridor fencing on riparian areas. Or other crazy things like total exclusion of one group or the other, or just calling each other bad names. But once you get by that and you start working together and get that synergy, things really do improve; you can feel it in the group. I think everybody in this group has felt it when we really start working together, you see good things happen, and that's what that consensus brings.

LEWIS RANDALL: Mr. Secretary, you asked how to form a group like that. I might suggest you form it kind of like OWIC got started. We got, when someone asked us what OWIC was, and we said well, we're a self-appointed prestigious group. And so we were just people that came together with diverse interests. And I think you could form these local groups real easy by the method you appoint the multiple use council. If you put the people on top that have the means to get something done, and then let anyone else that wants to come, any diverse interest at all, be a member on the committee. Then you can follow it right on up to a district level, to the state level, and on to your office. But I think by having people that have a genuine interest in the land, whether it be grazing, recreation, whatever, and let them volunteer instead of appointing people to those jobs, I think you'd

have good luck, you'd have success.

RICK ROSS: Yeah, Mr. Secretary, other members of our group here, I'd like to build a little bit on what Lew is talking about in terms of solutions to reach consensus, and how we go about that. And it inevitably, I think it's, part of it is leadership, and it rests in your lap, in the sense that enthusiasm goes a long ways. And you used the word encouragement earlier in your remarks. Now I think there is a very much a need for people in positions like yourselves, and down through your organization, that can show that enthusiasm to make that encouragement of people to do those kind of things. I think criticism, or turning off people, is so easy to do, and sometimes it seems difficult to find that encouragement to make those kind of things happen. So part of the answer to put in the bottle really is the leadership role, and really holding the people accountable in your organization from the standpoint of leadership accomplishments as a part of their responsibilities, that that is taken into account, because I really think there is a role there.

CAL COLE: One of the things, and Doc brought it up this morning, and I think that it's important, and even to the extent that it be written in, one of the things that we agreed on very early in OWIC is that dammit Doc, you're guilty of wrecking some land, we agreed not to do that, we don't find guilt. We're not; we don't blame anybody. We didn't, you know, I'm not going to, you know, I don't tell Ken that he ruined something. I don't tell any rancher he ruined something. At the same time, Doc doesn't come back, Ken doesn't come back and say, and "Well, you beat us up in court and did all this." We're not looking for guilt.

Because what happened literally, in a sense, and this is hard to swallow sometimes, but what happened in the past is the past. Forget it, you know, we are out to make a watershed function, and to get on with it and work together. Because working together we all came to the conclusion we'd just get a whole lot more done. And courts make a lousy, lousy resource decisions. So we don't look for guilt.

WAYNE ELMORE: I think one of the things that has made OWIC successful over the years was when we finally came to the realization that the one thing that we could agree on, and it goes along with Cal's search for the guilty that we got over, was that once we focused in on not saying that the

land was bad, but realizing that the land could be better, then we all set a common vision and a common goal. So we had a destination. Before we got to that point we were always arguing over the journey, the journey was the problem. And we realized that once you set a destination of a certain land use condition, and that everybody agrees to that, then the responsibilities for the journey are then divided up among the different stakeholders, and nobody looks over their shoulder to see whether they're getting it done. Because the trust factor is there that says, I know that rancher is going to do the things that he needs to do, and the fish people are going to watch for what happens to the riparian areas and make sure that populations are getting what they need. And it all starts to come together, so that as Cal said, the search for guilty then goes out the door. But the primary focus that I think has really made OWIC as successful as it's been is being able to focus in on the destination and not worry about the journey.

IRENE VLACH: I think one of the factors that makes OWIC's journey to take your image easy is that we can choose what we want to work on. And if OWIC doesn't agree on some issue, we can just move on to something else. I think if we are talking consensus groups that have to find a solution for a given watershed, they don't have these options that OWIC has to walk away from it if we don't agree. And in our discussion, we have come to the idea that maybe more important than reaching consensus is the search for consensus, meaning that you listen to the other person, you try to understand the other person's point of view. But we acknowledge that it might not always be possible to reach consensus, and in which case the land manager must make its decision with the best information that he/she got from the consensus group. And maybe he has to work with a majority/minority report.

BRUCE BABBITT: I'd like to just try out a couple of ideas as to the kinds of things that we might look to OWIC, or at least the local working groups. However, they grow up from the landscape, in whatever configuration, the Colorado Model, continuation of the kind of experience you've had with the Trout Creek Mountain working group. Here are some of the things that occur to me that we might explicitly discuss as subjects that you should attend to. Obviously, we would expect that these groups would be interested in the formulation of the resource management plans, allotment

management plans, that's an obvious place. I'd like to consider going beyond that. The first would be this issue of standards and guidelines, because that really goes to what Wayne was talking about, and the rest of you have. You've got to have a goal first. Now the draft regulations that come out are going to be quite different from the original proposal, because we will set up just four brief national goals, and then say to the BLM Districts, it's your job to formulate goals for this particular range, this particular watershed in this particular place, with all the variability of plant community of range, season, precipitation, and all of those things.

And it seems to me important to at least make an offer, not only to the multi-resource councils, but to the groups down on the ground to the extent that you want to participate in formulating standards and guidelines described by Wayne as goals. That's something we ought to try to work down to the ground level.

The rangeland improvement funds have traditionally been a subject for the grazing advisory boards, which, under the current, my current view of this will no longer exist. The functions of those grazing advisory boards ought to be picked up by these local groups, and that would include range improvement funds. If we move toward the idea of some kind of incentive fee as a reward for stewardship, it seemed to me that's a kind of thing that local groups ought to be involved in, in some measure. Those are just thoughts that I would invite you to kind of mull over.

DOC HATFIELD: I'd like to comment on that. I think any time you mix standards and guidelines with goals; you're missing the boat. And the places where we've seen success in reaching sound land management, they've almost, well, I shouldn't say invariably, but regularly, they're outside of arbitrary standards and guidelines. And if you could do anything that might help further this process would be that in places where there are legitimate consensus groups functioning, forget the standards and guidelines. Because it takes adaptive management to make these changes occur on an ecosystem basis. And if you're hamstrung by arbitrary rules that are meant to punish the bad apple, they're just in the way.

And it seems to me like that might be one of the carrots you could offer is in the places where legitimate working groups are functioning, and what would determine whether they're

legitimate or not is the diversity of them, and how much the community of interest, which includes the environmentalists from Portland, are represented. We'd just scrap a bunch of this arbitrary things. And then make it pretty tough for places where people want to play hardball with the land.

BOB ARMSTRONG: I'm not going to go to Reno until tonight, but I'd like to make a bet early. And I want to bet that your goals that you've come up with right now are pretty close to the goals or standards and guidelines that we're thinking about. Now give us an example of a goal that you've come up with, that --- and let's see.

DOC HATFIELD: Okay. A goal on the Trout Creek Mountains was, along the streams we wanted to see baby willows, and teenage willows, and middle age willows. And we want baby aspen, and teenage aspen, and middle age aspen, because they're important to hold the creek together, so the fish will be able to have baby fish, and teenage fish, and old fish. And that creek is coming from a watershed that was covered with a good stand of dense perennial grasses, and in that watershed there are baby ranchers, and middle age ranchers, and old ranchers functioning in an economical manner. (Applause)

BOB ARMSTRONG: Good.

DOC HATFIELD: And that's what a goal looks like. Now, what a standard and guideline looks like is 40% utilization on the streams, and 30% utilization here, and those things just get in the way. And I don't see how you can --- now I'd be interested to hear you define a goal that sounds like that.

BOB ARMSTRONG: I won the first one. (Laughter) Because we threw away the idea that you just mentioned about saying a salt block 300 yards from the last willow adjacent to whatever, and said two goals, the Secretary mentioned them, the second goal that we have is that we have improved riparian areas throughout the West. Now that sounds awful much to me like young willows, and young ranchers, and middle age willows, and middle age ranchers. So we're changing that. Now, how about one other one, and let's get out of the riparian areas.

DOC HATFIELD: Well, what's the standard and guideline though, that isn't a standard and guideline is it?

BOB ARMSTRONG: Well, that's what we're changing, and that's why I said that. The new ones

aren't going to be like the old standard and guidelines. The new ones are going to be very simple as the Secretary said, there are going to be four of them. The first one is range health, which we think everybody can agree with as a goal, because it's going to give you better opportunity for your commodity to get to market in good shape. And it gives us better opportunity to think that we're doing our responsibility. The second thing is the riparian areas, which we think should be improved. And we talk about things like water quality as our goals and as our standards. We're not going to get back into this little standard and guideline argument. We're going to let you decide what do you do for standards and guidelines that let us meet these goals of things like range health and better riparian areas. Does that make some sense?

DOC HATFIELD: Sounds good.

BOB ARMSTRONG: Okay.

FRED OTLEY: Yes, we like the sounds of that. The Oregon Cattlemen has a program that they're trying to develop, and they're going to be working with diverse interests, environmentalists and others to try to package this. You have received a copy of it, Mr. Secretary. It's based on some of the concepts that OWIC and other, you know, other working groups have put forward successfully. And this is in process, and we're hoping that it will go forward as a pilot program. And I like to think of the word as options, I heard that earlier, where we're looking at it not to supersede any existing, you know, legal or process, but it's one more option for people to get the job done on the land. And I like the idea of broad goals and objectives that allows a framework to work in, I suppose. But so many times, administratively they come down in terms of numbers, which gets mixed up as tools.

I'd just like to say from the working group process standpoint, I'm a new member of OWIC, but I have been involved on the, on working groups. And they can work; you always gain more than you lose by being involved in it. Sometimes you never get to where you want to get to. I would like to say that there is always a stimulation of positive response.

You know one of the things that we've faced is in terms of our public land management situation is, the agency comes out with alternatives prior to the public, the scoping process, the

formulation of alternatives. And they come out with these and they're designed to polarize people away from each other. It's real simple; you got alternatives A through E. A and E are both ridiculous, and in many cases the in between are too. And the reason is, is there was not diverse interest involved early on in the process to help formulate, really site specific on the ground things that work out there. So we've got to back this process up, and we really appreciate the difference in what you say in terms of bottoms up to the top, how'd we say it earlier, in our earlier meeting, support from the top for the process from the bottom, I think is really important here.

And I'd like to say that we're going to go forward; it works when people get together. You know, as a rancher, we invite people out, we've had a number of groups, environmentalists and others come to our ranch, and we're not there to educate them necessarily, Doc, because I learned that from you a long time ago. But one of the things ---

DOC HATFIELD: You'd still like to, though, wouldn't you Fred?

FRED OTLEY: Sure. (Laughter) But everybody here needs to understand that people that come from the city, or come from other areas, they look at things through different eyes. I think that's what we are working with here. And when you talk about it in a meeting room someplace, you're talking about the same thing two different ways. And the only way to resolve that is to get out on the land together, look at the same creek together, and usually if it's moderate people that care, instead of people that want to earn their beans through litigation, usually you find more in common, or more that you can agree on than disagree. And you don't have to have total consensus on these type of processes.

And I'd like to make one last statement, Mr. Secretary, is that these things cannot be put in a bottle, per se. Because each one of them that I've been involved with have been different. In one case it might be a group of three, and in another case it might be a group of thirty, and I think that's real important, because I don't think you need to can it necessarily. You just need it as an opportunity for some real grassroots involvement so we can retain our communities.

I hope there is four times as many people at the Elks as there is here. And I think you know why, because public lands are vital to us, they're vital to the livestock industry, our families, our

schools, our livelihoods. And we really appreciate you coming out here, and willing to look at this with us from the bottom up instead of the top down.

ELLEN BISHOP: I'd like to elaborate just for a minute on something that Fred touched on, and that is what do you put in the bottle. And I think Fred is right, and I think everyone in OWIC feels that, agrees, that these have to be individual processes. That the key to this is allowing diversity, allowing groups in one place to be different than another, and not to create a formula for them. The other thing that I think is key to success here is to allow those groups to work, as Fred said, sort of at the front door of the process, instead of at the back door. Allow them input at the beginning, and make them understand that their input is not only significant, but it's vital to this process. That they are the people who are in the driver's seat. Because I think all too often we have a fear of coming together, and a fear of getting involved in a process, because we begin to think well what good is that going to do, you know. It's okay, so we get together and talk about it.

The point that, the reason that OWIC has been successful is that even though we haven't agreed on everything, we've been able to be at the front of some processes, like the Trout Creek working group certainly has, we've known that that's going to make a significant difference in this. In fact, going to be the driver in how this is accomplished. And I think that those kinds of options for people, knowing that they make a difference individually, is a very important thing to get across to people.

BILL OBERTEUFFER: I'd like to suggest, Mr. Secretary, that you could use the last three letters of our group name OWIC, without asking permission of the rest of my group. We talk about watersheds. We don't like to talk about political lines, property boundary lines, setbacks from streams, areas for spotted owls, etc., etc. Lines on maps, except for watershed lines, sort of get in the way of doing good ecosystem management. If you use the "I", improvement out of our name, you might concentrate on setting up within your group, a group of scientists, which you already have, to monitor what these diverse coalitions do. And even let them make mistakes to the point where you can come around and say, "Come on out and let's take a look at your range, its got some problems here." And then you back out of the way and see what they do about it. Just call it to

their attention, be a monitoring device which lots of us aren't able to do.

The important thing is the "C", the coalition out of our name. Write that into your rules and regs so that you encourage coalitions, cooperative decision making. None of us are skilled at that, none of us, even you. Because when you came here to Baker City you said you were looking for something mysterious. Those of us in the audience, and those of us up front here, most of us grew up in families where we were told what to do, we went to schools where we were told what to do, we went to work where we were told what to do. We have a lot of experience with cooperative decision making, it's new, but look at the mess we've made of things in the last 75 years with autocratic decision making, and five to four decisions where the people would get outvoted, and go out to figure out how they're going to win next time. So let's try it at least. I had a woman in Lane County a couple of days ago who has had nothing but trouble with logging on her property, talking to me about OWIC, and she just recited, and recited, and recited about all these problems she'd had with regulations. And I was trying to talk to her about the OWIC philosophy, and she just kept pushing the idea away. And I said, "Okay, do you like what you've had for the last ten years?" "No, not at all." "Well, why don't you get a group of your neighbors together?" That's where we have to be. I'd like to suggest right now that each one of you out in the audience turn to your left, that won't work, will it; the next guy has to turn to his right. Forget it. (Laughter) You have to sit in a circle, don't you? Okay, enough said. Who's next?

MARY HANSON: Mr. Secretary, I wanted to say something. We focus on watersheds, and perhaps part of our uniqueness, because we are not driven by a specific bureaucracy or whatever, is that we cut across administrative boundaries. We ignore the lines on the map that says this is public land, this private land, or whatever. And I think that could be a national model. I don't know how you would do it, but I think you're in a position to maybe talk with your colleagues at Department of Ag. or whatever, many of the drainages in Oregon, in fact, have several public ownerships, that may be Forest Service, and BLM, as well as private and some state. Somehow, there must be some way to use this model so that it truly is watershed driven, so that all of the different ownerships there, not just the private land owners with the public lands that they run on, but also those folks in the

Forest Service and in the state government, because it is, truly needs to be a coordinated effort. Because all of those different entities have some sort of authority on those lands.

And I think, I like to look in the truly big picture, and I realize that your chore is to come up with a process for your agencies, but I would challenge you to work in the national framework that you have, and try to foster this same kind of idea with the other agencies. And to foster that collaboration with the states, because we all have to be involved. Thank you.

CAL COLE: One of the, there is two things I was thinking about, is one is that, and to encourage, and all you can do is encourage it. OWIC is never, you know, first of all, we have never gone onto a piece of private property without being invited. And it is, I have found, and I have learned that it is a difficult thing for the ranching community to ask, I believe, for advice on how to manage their own lands. Because historically, they've just never done this. It's a very, they're a very private type of community. Our history doesn't, you know, that grew up doing things their way, and it was kind of understood, you could, you talked to your neighbor at socials, but you really didn't, it was a private thing about how you did. And it's very difficult, and I really, you know, so we just have to encourage that.

The other thing, one of the things we did very early on, and I don't know quite how it developed, Doc and I all of a sudden, just one day we're standing out with OWIC on one of the streams someplace, and we just switched rolls for some reason. And I took Doc's position, from a cattleman's side, and Doc took my position from an environmental side, and we found all of a sudden that we learned a great deal very fast. And if there is some way, you know, just --- and you can't write regs that says do this. But it certainly can be in there to suggest this, just to give the idea to people to reverse their rolls. Because it forces, it forced me to try to say, okay, now if I was doing this from Doc's view, what would I do, as opposed to thinking about it from my point of view, which, you know, which is definitely different. So, those are, they're just little hints, but they are things that I think make a difference, and they make us work together better.

DAVE MOSKOWITZ: Secretary Babbitt, you might be able to put that as one of the ... elements of the range ecosystem training that is proposed, you could have role reversals as part of that. I

have a question that came up, that was discussed this morning among OWIC regarding application of existing federal public participation laws. And it's something that OWIC has not dealt with directly, but the applicability of the public participation laws under National Environmental Policy Act, Federal Advisory Committee Act, Administrative Procedures Act, present some sticky wickets, you might say, for some of these processes to be successful.

We're perhaps not successful, but at least they are issues that remain unresolved, and I'm curious, we're all curious among OWIC, in OWIC, about how Interior intends to deal with that, because in the statements that have been made thus far, there is talk about streamlining and changes. And those always raise a lot of red flags. So we're curious as to whether a working group, or consensus group process would be changed to comply with those laws, or whether there is going to be an attempt to change those laws so the existing working group proposal moves forward.

BRUCE BABBITT: Yeah, I think that's an important question, and we've wrestled with it a lot.

Because we really have to conceive of working groups which are either clearly outside the flypaper of federal law and compliance. Or, on the other hand, groups which take on all of that burden of formality in order to sort of be a part of the process. Now, I hope we can draft these regulations to say, that's your choice. If OWIC wants to operate with total freedom, it's absolutely free to do so. The, that distinction really underlies the Colorado Model. Because the Colorado Model was drafted by the Colorado working group to fit under the framework of federal law, of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and all of the others. And it was drafted in a very specific way to say we are going to keep as much freedom as possible, but still within the structure so that we can be a little closer and have a little more input, sort of on a direct day-by-day basis and get more directly involved in rangeland improvement, a fund allocation and that kind of thing.

But I stress again that that's an option, and it will be drafted as such. For those of you who want to retain your complete freedom, I think that's a sensible option, and we're going to recognize it.

DOC HATFIELD: One thing I'd like to say that, just so everybody doesn't get the wrong idea, these consensus groups are very hard work, and they're not easy, and they're not all roses. And I was very

active, and Connie was, on the Trout Creek working group, and I think the ranchers involved in that would say yes, their future looks better because of it. But their immediate situation is not near as good as it was before that happened. And as a matter of fact, the changes they made, may be severe enough that some of them may not be able to survive economically.

But when you're in a wilderness study area with an endangered fish, you don't have real good options to continue on like you've always done it. And like you've always done it is probably the most economical and the handiest, and that's why it's been done that way forever. So, I think it would help if even you could acknowledge that these changes aren't going to be easy, they're going to hurt, they're going to put some people out of business. But if we don't make the changes, everybody is going to be in the same bind that timber people are on the West side.

And I think that's the focus that keeps this driving is, is that we've got to find a solution because we aren't that big in the West. And even with the environmental community in the West and the ranch community in the West working together, we're still a small spot, and Bob Smith mentioned the filibuster and all, but that was a little too close to make me comfortable. I was a little worried your original package was going to pass, and I felt it to be a disaster. So (applause) let's don't make this sound like it's easy, it's good and we need to do it, and it's probably the least worst option we have. But it's not, it's not going to be like it's always been in the West. And when we're in change, it's stressful.

BRUCE BABBITT: I'd like to just respond briefly to that, because I think it's a pretty profound insight. These groups clearly are not for everybody. And there will be plenty of areas in the West where people will say the intensity of this kind of search for consensus and the possibility of some short to middle term pain that it is perhaps in, if not most, at least in many cases, an inclusive part of it, is not for us. So the question then becomes as you suggest, why would anyone want to walk into the middle of this kind of process. And I would simply suggest this, because when you do find consensus you really then have control of the situation and you place the managers and the federal bureaucrats into a, you put them up in the bleachers, you really do. At that point you really drive us into a passive position which is where we want to be, because we can say to all of the stake holders

all over the country, these people have put their act together and they've done it by involving all of the stakeholders. And so that's the guarantee that that process can go forward.

Now, if people choose not to do it, or if groups fail, which they certainly will, because this is tough stuff, where are we? Well, if you can't make it work, or you don't want to make it work, or you fail, you got a back door, and we were in the first place. Which, in the long run, as you suggest, probably is not going to be good because the same old antagonisms, and divisions, and quarrels will continue, and they'll ultimately drive us into directions that probably aren't going to be good for any of us.

FRED OTLEY: Mr. Secretary, the world of litigation that we have been living in the last ten years gives agency personnel, and this is not reflected of that in a negative way, a lot of reasons not to do anything. And there is a lot of people that, you know, their businesses are depending on cost effective management. They can operate with security, and tenure, and knowledge that they're going to be there. This is really important because not doing something to some of these watersheds from an ecological standpoint is our greatest problem right now. I have a picture here I'll leave with you, before you leave, hopefully, where it's all bare ground and it's an area that has never been grazed.

There is a whole bunch of factors, and I think this is not properly reflected on by this group yet here, so I'll do it right now. For every problem we have, there is a, well let me say first off there is a whole bunch of positive things going on out there in individual forest unit or operations. Just the amount of improvements have been immense. And I think it was brought up earlier that, you know, more can be done by Representative Smith, that's true.

I think the key here is to remember that a whole bunch of factors are involved in most problems, and that's why a diverse interest group is very important, because they represent all of those factors usually. And the second part of it is everybody must key in on the positive things that are going on, and the positive changes that have occurred. And frankly, in the last ten years in terms of litigation, and people's method of operation, and terms of regulations, they're emphasizing the negative, they're emphasizing what is wrong, and not keying on what is right and what can be

done better. And I think as this thing goes forward, and the way you have outlined it, I'm hopeful that will become a positive package instead of one based on negativism.

BRUCE BABBITT: Just a brief response to this. I've thought a lot across the last few years about why it is that we're always staring in the face of litigation, which is divisive, disruptive, it brings things to a halt, it polarizes people, and you know, I guess I say this in, to some degree in self-criticism. I think one reason that there has been so much litigation is because, as you suggest, we have not been together in a proactive position. Sort of the permittees, the communities, the regulators having the power in the preparation to put a consensus position before a court against these kind of outside attacks. And it really is just another way of saying that this is one area that I think illustrates the kinds of things we have been talking about, and the possibilities for kind of turning the tide in these areas where you have some consensus and have really given some thought to it.

JOHN MONFORE: I might make one comment about the process of, also, and that it's never really over. It's not like something, you can say well, gee, we did that, and so we can say okay, now it's on to other things. It has to be built on a process of continuous improvement as we go through time. And there also has to be a reliable process established so that when the group is working on something else, it doesn't look over its shoulder and find that everything has gone back to the way it was; there is, nothing is happening. It has to have those two ingredients, the process of continuous improvement, and a reliable process established as it goes. Otherwise, it will be just a temporary quick fix, and then there will be another problem six months later, a year later.

CAL COLE: Yeah it, I've got, you know, a comment, much --- I think to the audience here this afternoon I'd like to make, just to, you know --- my, and this is just personal, my objective is watershed, healthy watershed management. And I think in the environmental groups, most of which on OWIC, you know, so that it's not a misunderstanding, our objective is not to keep grazing in public lands. That isn't my objective at all. If that, if good watershed management allows for some forage for domestic stock, that's okay. If it allows for some fishing, harvest some fish, that's okay. If it allows for hunting and to harvest some game, that's okay. But if it doesn't, we have to,

and we can't have that and have good watershed management, that's okay too.

And I just want to make sure that, you know, so that, you know, Doc has a different objective, Ken has an objective, he wants, they want the ranching community, obviously doesn't want to stay on grazing on public lands. And if healthy watershed management allows that, it's okay with me, but that's not my objective.

KEN BENTZ: You can see why this a diverse interest group. And also it points out that we don't always agree. And, but I spent eight years going to these meetings, thirty some odd of them now I think, and I think we do agree enough of the time to make it worthwhile.

ELLEN BISHOP: I think that Ken just alluded to something, and so have other speakers that is very important in these groups, and that is that Ken spent eight years working with OWIC and learning how to talk to Cal. Doc has invested a lot of time, and Mary and Lew spent a lot of time doing this. These are not groups that come together for a week, meet, achieve a consensus on one issue and then go away. These groups have to be, not only made of people who are going to make a commitment to achieve consensus on one issue, it has to be a commitment for a group that can learn to talk to one another, can learn to trust one another. If we in this group didn't trust one another enough to occasionally put our deepest, darkest thoughts out on the table for discussion, and for other people to understand what we really felt about things, it would not be a true consensus group, it would be a group that kind of scratched the surface of the mosquito bite and went away, and never bothered to kill any mosquitoes.

I think that that's a very, very important part of consensus, is that these groups need to learn to know one another, to know the land they're working with, to know the community that they're working with, and if they are people who are part of the community of interest, they also need to know the local community place as well. That we can't have a complete disconnection between those two, that there has to be a strong connection between the community of interest working along with, and to benefit the community of place as well as their own interests. But it is the long-term commitment to one another, and to the place that you're trying to achieve consensus about, I think that's important.

FRED OTLEY: I'll make one last comment because Dale mentioned it at the start of the program, and I think I need to bring it back, because we're talking about a community based process, Mr. Secretary, as being vitally important. And that means, I think, all the way across this country a strong involvement of local government. They're a vital link in whatever package you come out with, and I hope that they're involved in these type of processes we're talking about today, that they are and should be, very actively involved in all land management issues.

ELLEN BISHOP: I think they should be actively involved, but they shouldn't be in a situation, at least from what I've seen of consensus where they are a controlling interest, they should be a participant in the process.

JOHN MONFORE: I think one of the members from an earlier discussion said it very well in terms of how the overall situation could work best from your standpoint, Mr. Secretary, and that would be support from the top, for the process from the bottom. And that's not always an easy thing to do with the pressures that you face from all different directions. But it's probably getting out that reliable process I was talking about earlier, support from the top, and process from the bottom. And I didn't author that, that was one of the other fellows on the ---

DAVE MOSKOWITZ: Secretary Babbitt, another question that we have, that we touched on, you touched on earlier and it involves the formality of the mobile resource advisory councils. And you mentioned earlier that they're going to be, they either are, they already are mandated by current statute or will be. I, could you just ---

BRUCE BABBITT: Yeah, they are mandated under existing law.

DAVE MOSKOWITZ: By existing law.

BRUCE BABBITT: Yeah.

DAVE MOSKOWITZ: And the question that maybe, possibly remains unsettled, although maybe there is some evidence its come out already, is where you would envision a group like OWIC falling in terms of within the hierarchy of a district multiple use advisory council at a BLM District level, below that. And because of the concerns we have are that the proposals so far, they're fairly formal for those groups. Fifteen people allocated among a number of different interest groups

appointed by the governor, approval by yourself, and there is definite concern among members of OWIC that that doesn't encompass a broad enough reach of the community. And we feel very strongly about that, what John just said about the support from the top, for bottom up effort. That bottom we view is very broad, whether you live in Portland or whether you live in Burns, that the community is broad. And so we're still, I guess we're still looking for a little clarification on, not just clarification, but a little guidance on where you see a group like OWIC coming, given your constraints under existing law.

BRUCE BABBITT: I guess I turn the question back just for this purpose. Describe to me, as you perceive it, I sense that OWIC functions sort of in a changeable kind of way. That you are a, once a statewide organization, and that you also seem to settle in at the local level in selected circumstances. Is that fair?

DOC HATFIELD: I think it would be fairer to say that the communications that resulted because of OWIC made some of these local broad-based diverse interests that included the community of interest from Portland possibly exist, that really weren't a part of OWIC, but they were possible because of the communication that OWIC allowed. So OWIC doesn't run around in, as a group do something, they get together and we talk about things, and we share ideas, and then occasionally we have something like you showing up which gives us a great pressure to come up with something a little clearer.

But basically we are a think tank that helps make work groups possible. But we aren't a work group very often. We were in Bridge Creek, but that was the only case where OWIC itself was the work group. So, does that help?

BRUCE BABBITT: I think so, because it seems to me that if I can sort of comment on what I perceive your function to be, that OWIC's role under this structure that we are moving toward is enormously enhanced. You remain yourselves, and it seems to me you're not looking for any kind of bureaucratic tag, but that what we're really after in this new model is powering up and inviting the participation, and listening for the advice of local watershed working groups. Knowing that we can't wave a magic wand and create those groups, that's the fastest way to destroy them. Because

by definition, they are not part of the bureaucratic process.

Now it seems to me that we say, here is the possibility, and who takes advantage of it is really not in our hands, but in the hands of local communities and in your hands to the extent that you know how to facilitate those groups as they come up from the landscape.

DAVE MOSKOWITZ: Thank you, that helps a lot. On that, just as Mary says we're kind of loosely organized, but we have our own little bureaucracy. And one of the things that has the bureaucracy as you get that kind of political correctness, one of the political correctness elements that has evolved within OWIC, is we're kind of banning that word local. And so, I feel a little bit like a schoolteacher, but we try to use that term community interest. And maybe that's a, perhaps that's a messy term, but I guess it comes up, just about every time the word local comes up in our group, so since you mentioned it, I'm just going to bring it up again. We do, we just, the idea of local control I think that it puts a red flag up for many groups, it tends to limit the spectrum of interest so, anyway you hear what I'm saying I'm sure, and I hope that that community interest term isn't too awkward.

BRUCE BABBITT: I believe that words do count, they carry meaning, and they do shape discussions. And I hereby pledge before the assembled audience, that I will never again, west of the Missouri River, use the word local, I will use the word community. (Applause)

DEAN BIBLES: I'd like to pitch in a minute here. I think the question that Mary asked awhile ago about what is a watershed, and hopefully the issues that have been raised recent --- a lot of times about what happened west of the Cascades, maybe some of the things that has been going on over there might be instructive, I hope so.

But we have struggled for quite some time with the issue of this watershed thing. And I happen to chair a regional inter-agency committee that includes people from Northern California, the states up through Washington. And we've been trying to address this same issue. And so we finally, about two weeks ago, after many months of working with a lot of people, drew some lines around sub-basins and came up with provinces. And then for the first time then we now have something that you can, that we all agree, and are starting to develop province teams. This is a

place that the tribes can now address issues. To place the counties, a place that all of the ownerships within that province now can start addressing it on the ground.

I know that regional forester John Lowe and I now believe that since we've done it over there, we in a very broad sense, it's time that we should probably be thinking about doing the same thing in the eastern, east of the Cascades. So that we can now start making some sense out of how do we address this, how can you start getting these community of interest, and agreeing on some lines that are not BLM Districts, that are not national forests, or not wildlife refuge, but include all of the ownerships. And we've added these sub-basins together that make some sense, and hopefully this might be a link that we can use that, and say let's try to get something that we can start addressing, specific issues over here.

MARY HANSON: Mr. Secretary, Dean Bibles, I think that's a great idea. I'm happy to hear that. But I also wanted to, if I could, so it's clear in my mind, repeat what I thought I heard the Secretary say about how the community of interest working groups would function. If I heard you right, I heard you say that if there was a will among some diverse interests to focus on an area and come up with some management direction, that your process would allow for them to have that input, and that it would be recognized. But there would also be, the normal process would also be there for those areas that perhaps didn't have that. Is that what I heard you say?

BRUCE BABBITT: Yes.

MARY HANSON: Okay.

BILL PIERATT: Can you hear me now? Thanks. Woke everybody up. Are you feeling that you have more to say? Do you want to go on for a while, or would you like to move on to the next segment? Think about it a minute. I want to alert the audience --- I'm sorry? Okay. If you have yet the desire to hand in one of those 3 x 5 cards and haven't, now would be a real good time to do that. And we're going to proceed on, is that the consensus? You want to move on to the next segment, or you have some more things to say? Okay. Well, I have this squeaky wheel, and we're going to move on then into the next segment of our program where we give you all, the audience, the opportunity to interact with this group up here. You may of course, make statements to whoever

you want to address them to. You can ask questions of whoever you want to ask them of, and we're going to begin.

I guess I'll say one thing. When people want to participate, they want to feel like they had a fair chance, and this is my answer to that. I've been at meetings where I personally was convinced that the questions that got asked were planted by the people they were asked of. Or that somebody who was managing or controlling the meeting went through the questions and decided what would be nice to hear. Now I'm here before you, telling you that this is my answer to eliminate that feeling. And if it looks corny, that's the motivation.

I wanted to have this meeting in Reno, but I got outvoted. I'm going to draw these two or three at a time. We're going to feel our way into this, and so we may change the process as we go along. I'm going to call on three people; you make your way to the open mikes. A couple of these apparently look to be statements. And the first one, if I can read it, is Tan Hermens. Another individual who will follow is Mark; I'm going to foul this one up, McKenzie perhaps, and Tom Trindle. So if you all can make your way to an open mike here in the isles, and make your statements or ask your questions, and we'll begin with what I'm calling Tan.

TAN HERMENS: My name is Tan Hermens, this is the first thing I've ever won in my life. I've been sending Publishers Clearing House in for 20 years. (Laughter) I have about five things I would like to ask of Senator Babbitt, because, or excuse me Secretary Babbitt, but I'll limit it to one. I thought I probably wouldn't be asked so I wouldn't have the chance to use one that other people have used. But Secretary Babbitt, you have stated that one of the biggest mistakes the federal government has ever made was allow the individual states to control the water. And the control of the water happened with the writing of the constitution to the 10th Amendment. Grabbing control of the water was the hidden agenda of the last grazing reform package. And once this was realized, that realization was instrumental in the defeat of the package. For we all know that he who controls the water, controls the land. How and why do you justify defying the 10th Amendment?

(Applause)

BRUCE BABBITT: Well let me see if I can't move from defiance of the 10th Amendment, to what

it is we propose and will put out in the form of the draft regulations. There was some confusion in the original package, because the language was not very precise. And our attempt in the next draft is going to be very precise and it's going to, I think read as follows: The one issue relating to water, and the only issue relating to water that will be treated in these regulations will be the following issue, and that is who holds title for water developed in the future on BLM land for the purpose of stock watering, with those water rights to be obtained under state law.

In the future public land, stock tanks, water rights acquired under state law, that's what we're talking about. And the question, the only question in these regulations, and in range reform will be, how should those, in whose name are those water rights registered. Are they registered in the name of the permittee, or the Bureau of Land Management, or jointly in the name of both? Now that answer in most states will be to some degree dictated by state law.

And the only remaining issue then is what are the provisions of the cooperative agreement between the permittee and the Bureau of Land Management, with respect to that developed water. Our concern, to be treated by these regulations, is to make sure that that developed water stays with the permit for the purpose of stock watering. And that the cooperative agreement makes it clear that the permit holder does not have a separate interest in that water which can be alienated, transferred, sold away from the land. It simply says the water goes with the land and with the permit, that's it.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. Can you hear me? Yeah, sounds good. I'm going to call on Mark McKenzie is the name I'm pronouncing, hope that's not butchering the name too bad. Your turn is now.

MARK McKENZIE: Well Mr. Babbitt my question was in your earlier proposals, and what not dealing with nonuse. Have you modified that or changed that in any way?

BRUCE BABBITT: Yes, we've thrown it out the window.

MARK McKENZIE: Thank you sir.

BILL PIERATT: Okay. Before we hear from our next speaker here in the theater, I'd like to alert those folks in the Elks Club that Jim Anderson's name has been drawn and if he would make his

way over here, he'll get his turn. Tom Trindle.

TOM TRINDLE: Yes, I'm from Baker County. My wife and I have grazing rights for nearly a thousand AUM's. Some of these rights have been used by family members for three generations. Four months out of the year I spend the majority of my time on these allotments, days and nights. Last year it cost us nearly \$8,000 to maintain the improvements on those allotments. Over the last five years we've invested nearly \$20,000 of our own money into those allotments. Your policy changes in range reform '94, with the proposed fee increase, would be devastating to our operation.

I ask you, Secretary Babbitt, to work with the Oregon Cattlemen's Association and OWIC and give authority to the local ranchers and small communities to decide their destiny. It is clear to me that small communities such as Burns, Baker, Jordan Valley and so on are prosperous, the federal government will prosper too. If you, Secretary Babbitt and President Clinton, can't see this, then you're not looking. If the testimony from the hearings such as this falls on deaf ears, I feel it's the responsibility of the citizens of the West to take stronger and more drastic action. Thank you.

(Applause)

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. Before I call the name of our next speaker who is here, I'd like to alert others of you whose names have been drawn. I have cards here for Bob Elder, Jim Howard, Jeff McKenzie, Merle Brown, and I guess a statement that I'm going to read. So Jim, if you're here, let's hear from you. Bob Elder, Jim Howard, be ready.

JIM ANDERSON: Well, the first thing you got to remember that I'm not very good at this, I'm more than a touch nervous. I'd like to ask the Secretary, you know back in the '60's, I think it was, I was pretty small then, but we went through a big long process there at our place at home, and we had official people there, checking our acreages, and they were measuring how much hay we raised. And I asked my dad what's going on here? And he told me, he said, "Well we've got to have enough land here, and enough hay here, to take care of our cows when they're not on the BLM ground, this is part of the adjudication and commensurate ability and all those things." And then through the years, you know, we had to own this land. And the law changed I think, the rules changed, we just had to own the land capable of producing that feed. We didn't have to raise the

feed per se; we could raise sugar beets perhaps. We can't, but some people are lucky enough to be able to raise a crop that was a little more valuable than hay.

But we had to do that in order to hold this permit, you know. And not to me, unlike a water right, you had to own something to have something. So what happened to this, is this gone? And, you know, if it's not gone, then let's just say I've got a right to graze cattle, I've got "X" number of AUM's out there on that land. I don't own that land, no way, but I own some of that grass. And I have to provide for good watershed and reasonable riparian values, reasonable.

And wildlife, they have to be taken care of, but after that, there is some of that grass that should be mine. And a fee increase to me is, why am I paying for something I already own over administrative costs. And why should I have to pay through regulations, which is what regulations are, if they hamper me from exercising my right to have something that I already own. Why should I have to pay that? Those are takings, those are extortions. And if they become too much they are -- well I was not going to say this, but I just can't, not. It's one of the isms, and I had some isms, I pronounced that name badly, he was an economist in the '40's, socialism, fascism, communism, they're all the same. And thank you. (Applause)

BILL PIERATT: Mr. Secretary, do you have a response that you'd like to make to that?

BRUCE BABBITT: No, I listened carefully. Well, here is the basic, I think there are two thoughts. First of all, I think BLM for the last sixty years has been pretty relaxed about the use of base property. The concept of base property, under the Taylor Grazing Act, was basically a way of saying that the grazing rights, the allotments, will be drawn up by giving preference to people who live in the neighborhood. And the way you figured that out was to say you need to have a base property. And I think the Taylor Grazing Act said it could be either a piece of ground or a customary use or entitlement to a water right. So, in fact, your use of the base property, I think, has been very liberally interpreted by BLM. The only idea of that was to say, to help get these allotments worked out and to make sure that there is some way of keeping track of the transfer of permits, by saying the base property goes with them. But, with respect to the AUM's that are on public land, I think that it has been clear since 1934 that Congress simply requires the Bureau of

Land Management to charge for forage, which is produced on public land.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. We'll next hear from Bob Elder.

BOB ELDER: Mr. Secretary, I want to first take this opportunity to really thank you for coming out to the West, and hope that you will continue to do such. One of my concerns, that is a great concern to me, is the future for youth on our organizations. And as I read through your Rangeland '94 proposal, it has as already been mentioned by several people, it looked like the economics of trying to continue to operate. The majority of our operations with federal permits would be quite difficult, and therefore make it virtually impossible to interest youth in continuing to be involved in our profession. And I'd like to know if you have taken that into consideration, or are currently taking it into consideration how to involve young people in ranching opportunities.

BRUCE BABBITT: Well, my view of this is that we need to find a consensus that grazing has an important place on the western landscape. That it is an economically productive and ruminative use of the land, and that we all have a stake in making certain that there are ranchers on the land not just now, but in the next generation, into the next generation, and in the next generation. Because it's important for the western economy, for the diversity of our local communities. And I think it's something that we can all come together on. As much as local groups may diverge on specifics, it seems to me that there surely out on the western landscape, a consensus among wildlife interest, sportsman, local officials, local merchants, and ranchers, that a diverse, strong local economy is a good thing. It's good for the land, it's good for the communities, it's good for everybody.

Now the grazing fee issue has obviously been controversial, and we're not going to reach a perfect solution in the eyes of everybody. Bear in mind that the House of Representatives has repeatedly passed an AUM proposal of slightly more than \$8 per AUM. The proposal that we put out last summer has an AUM which would rise to \$4.28 in steps over three years. The debate in the Congress last fall was over a figure of \$3.45 in steps over three years. And I think as a practical matter that's the range that is realistically under discussion at this point.

Now in addition to that, I would say that the proposal that is finally put out will include this concept of an incentive discount, an incentive fee reduction. That's an idea that Congress put in the

Public Rangelands Improvement Act back in 1976, and Congress really urged the department to see if we can't deal with this fee issue by saying, if you buy into a good consensus base range improvement plan, there will be a discount for stewardship. That concept has never been put into play by the department. I intend to do that. And whatever the exact final fee increase number, I am going to parallel it with an incentive fee offer, which if I were to write it today would say, we will be offering discounts under the authority of the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 30% off the fee. In those cases, where the permit holder is either managing, or is under an allotment management plan in which there is agreement that we are moving toward the goals which have been established for good rangeland management and the sustainable production of both forage and ecosystem diversity.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. Let's hear next from Jim Howard.

JIM HOWARD: I'm an old pharmacist from, and drugstore owner from Lakeview, Oregon, and I've been there for 67 years, and operating that store for 44. And I just want to talk to, remind all you fellows that when you're talking about grass, and also Chuck Graham, the timber, that what you're really talking about is the viability of an environment, and I don't hear anybody talking about people, except Bob Elder, I thought that was good. The future for our kids in agriculture isn't very bright. And frankly, it isn't very bright for anybody living in a small community in Eastern Oregon from Lakeview to Burns, up to Wallowa where our friend has built a new log house, you know who I'm talking about. (Laughter) We have very fragile communities, and I'm a health care professional, that's a new term for what anybody involved in any part of the medical profession is, but, and we are really fragile. If we lose our hospitals, hence our doctors, we've lost our community. And we've, and our schools are really threatened anyway. And we grow good kids, and that's one of our best crops we have. And we educate them, we have lots of scholarships, and we send them out in the world with a good education and a good work ethic, and you the people of the United States benefit from Eastern Oregon kids that go all over the United States eventually. Because we haven't got enough jobs locally to survive.

And we're completely dependent upon the economic use of federally owned land. And

especially you people that, and I compliment the environmental groups that are here. The ones that are the biggest problems are not here, regrettably. But when they talk about no tree cutting, and no grazing, what they're really talking about is destroying the health care insurance and ability to provide health care in all of the communities in Eastern Oregon. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

BILL PIERATT: Let's hear from the next speaker.

MERLE BROWN: Well, I'm like the fellow across the room, I'm not too used to this kind of business either. They just mentioned people, that's one thing they're coming in from all over the world, immigrants, legal and illegal, we do have to somehow feed people. I'm from the Willamette Valley, I was born in Newport, and I've been in the fishing, and I've been a planer operator and lumber grader, and now I'm a gold miner. I've been all over Oregon. Somehow, especially in the Willamette Valley, some of the best farmland in the world, and plenty of water, a lot of it's sub-irrigated, has been turned into malls and just houses after houses for miles on beautiful land. And one of the things, you mentioned this riparian. If you'd go out to some of these rancher's fields that have developed over maybe a hundred years, go out at night, you'd have to get a permit from the ODFW if you was going to use a light, and see who is eating some of these willows. Even like downtown in the business area in Canyon City you'll see deer up eating plants, and shrubs, and flowers. But along these riparian areas that the rancher has developed, there are deer and elk, that's the main thing they do is browse on these different trees. But they also eat the grass. And if you'll go down in the wintertime the ODFW won't feed these animals in the winter. You'll find there is a lot of deer and elk both around that rancher's hay piles.

The riparian mainly they're talking about they want to do this for the salmon. If you go out east of here on the other side of Juntura, and you'll find, I think it's the South Fork of the Malheur. There isn't any riparian at all. You can drive along there for an hour, and if somebody didn't point out where the river was, you wouldn't know it. There used to be salmon come up that river, now there isn't. But if you assign number values for the loss of salmon, all of agriculture, logging, mining, and cattle, you'd sign the number one for the loss. You'd sign for fishing, commercial and

sport, plus the Indian nets in the Columbia, somewhere between five and six. Dams, without fish ladders especially, and the seals and sea lions and other fish and bird predators of salmon, you'd sign about a twenty.

Now, I'd like to mainly remember that this riparian business and the ranchers probably contribute more, especially with their irrigation ditches, they have created riparian areas and wetlands. And go out along where they have worked and see the animals that are feeding and you'll see, probably in a lot of cases a lot more wild animals feeding than you will the guys cattle. Thank you. (Applause)

BRUCE BABBITT: I'd like to just say a few words. First of all, I certainly agree that the salmon problem is very largely a problem of a lot of dams across the river system. It doesn't have a whole lot to do with ranching practices, let's say. It's a river problem, and we're going to have to honestly and forthrightly come to grips with those realities.

I've been out looking at the land since I was five or six years old. I grew up in a ranching family, and I used to go out on Sunday afternoons with my grandfather, who was then in his 80s, and he had actually homesteaded up in Northern Arizona in 1886. And we'd go out, and even in his 80s, he still couldn't stand the sight of locoweed. And we would undertake the hopeless task of personally pulling up everyone we saw all afternoon on Sunday. And we'd look at the condition of the cattle and worry about whether or not the summer rains were coming.

And he spent a lot of time talking to me about the changes that he had made on this ranch that he had built up over much more than half the century by then, and done it by living simply and saving money and reinvesting it in his cattle and in the land. And he pointed out to me that this rangeland in 1950, well, it was really the late '40's, early '50's, was in vastly better condition than it was back in the old days of the open range. Because he had put his money into fencing pastures. He had developed water, and actually had a water system that ran for about, almost thirty miles off the San Francisco Peaks down into the dry land. And he was really proud of that stuff. And when I think back on what has happened on that rangeland in the 45 years that I've been, of watching it and participating in a family ranch, it's gotten steadily better.

And the point I want to make is simply this: I'm not here to deny a fact that I think is important and obvious. And that is, for the most part, the western rangeland has been improving since the days of the Taylor Grazing Act. You know the notion that there hasn't been any progress, or that the rangeland is headed downhill, is not accurate. And that's not my starting point. My starting point is an outright concession, with pleasure, and pride, and acknowledgement that we're moving in the right direction in the West. And what these changes, and what this debate about, is continuing that, and accelerating it to the extent that it's reasonably possible, and making certain that we look out there and find the good examples and devise a system which says we want to bring the not so good management up toward a higher standard that we can now see out there in operation on many parts of this range.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. I'm going to call three more names, and while those folks are making their way to the mike, I'm going to read a question that has come from the Elks Club for Secretary Babbitt. The next three after I read this question are Jeff McKenzie, Merle Brown, and Mike Bentz. So you all may --- or did we already have Merle? I thought I messed that up. That's the first mistake I ever made in my life. Okay. The three are Jeff McKenzie, Mike Bentz, and Mark Doverspike. Secretary Babbitt, this is a question from our neighbors across the street at the Elks Club. This group, meaning OWIC, has shown that it has ideas that work. Would you be willing to give up the brute power that you now hold for a solution to many problems in the West?

BRUCE BABBITT: Yes.

BILL PIERATT: You know that was a pretty easy answer, wasn't it?

BRUCE BABBITT: It's an easy answer because that's the clear message behind the speech that I made in Colorado Springs two days ago. My response to this group, the learning curve that we have been on since last summer, I've heard the message from the West, real clear about the importance of going back to community.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. A statement from Jeff McKenzie.

JEFF MCKENZIE: I ranch down in Plush, Warner Valley, Southern Oregon. Our ranching operation deals with private, state, and federal land. It allows us during pastures that were drouthy,

allows us to take advantage of ranges that are in good condition, with good water, to rest for a portion of time the ranges that have been affected most by the drought where there isn't water, where it would be costly to haul water to those areas. We're able to rest our private ground in the winter and be on the BLM ranges, and the state permits and go up into the Forest Service in the summer. It allows us enough flexibility to feel we have a management plan of our own. And it gives us the ability to be good stewards of the land, not to overuse the lands that have been hit hardest, or hit hardest by drought.

One short comment in closing, the weather we had last winter showed me that none of us are really as important as we think we are. The water that we got, the precipitation that we got last winter, saved all our butts. (Laughter) (Applause)

BILL PIERATT: Next we'll hear from Mike Bentz.

MIKE BENTZ: It's a honor, Mr. Secretary, to be this close to, probably I haven't been this close to a person that has as much power over my future as you, since I stood next to my father and mother when I was less than ten years old. (Laughter) (Applause) This working group, this OWIC, that we were listening to today, gave me a warm fuzzy feeling all over. It's wonderful, the only question I have is, within this group, as I understand it, there needs to be a 100% consensus. That's great in, they're working with problems, and they have time to work with them, and they've already said that there is a lot of them they have not solved. When you put this type of a group into facilitate making decisions that have to be made, and with time restraints, I see a breakdown coming, and I see that the power is not going to lie within the group. Another part of this group is trust, and to be honest, Mr. Secretary, that's really lacking when it comes to concerning you, when we look at your past record. Thank you. (Applause)

BILL PIERATT: Our next statement will ---

BRUCE BABBITT: Rather than embarking upon, at least before this audience, a futile defense of my past record, let me just say a word about what I anticipate by consensus. Because I agree with you that, you know, the ideal that a few really, really good leaders like Doc and some of the others can get with this tremendous input of time, may be a unanimous agreement. I'm not sure that that's

really always a realistic standard to say, you know, we're not going to listen to you or move forward unless everybody agrees. Because if you say unanimous, that really does give kind of an extortion power to the one or two unreasonable people who may show up in any given context.

What I would suggest for an alternate meaning of consensus is to say that, whether it's in the district, the multi-use district resource councils, or in any of these working groups, what we're really looking for is a fair degree of consensus that involves all of the major stakeholders. What you want to ask is, do the permittees generally buy that? Are the environmentalists mostly in favor, or the sportsmen's groups, or the local officials, 75% mostly, a large majority in favor? And I think perhaps that's a more realistic goal, but one that we should in any event continue to debate, and talk, and work about.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. Mark, let's hear from you, Mark Doverspike.

MARK DOVERSPIKE: Secretary Babbitt and the board, I'd like to welcome you to Harney County. I'm a Harney Countian myself. Two things that I heard talking from, today off the OWIC board that I'd like to reiterate very strongly is, is the first one is regulations and standards and guidelines. This organization, within the BLM and the Forest Service, they not only have their own, and, but they also tie our hands in making the management changes and improvements that everybody wants. We see a lot of people going from BLM to Forest Service ground, and the rules change as soon as you cross that imaginary line. If nothing else, go back and talk to your Secretary of Ag, your counterpart there, and try to come up with some consensus among the two organizations so that we as ranchers and land managers go out onto this ground, we're all playing under the same set of rules and it doesn't change when we move off the January or March, excuse me, May 30th off the BLM, and June 1st onto the Forest Service, or state lands as well.

The other thing that I would like to reiterate, and maybe, is once we have a plan, let's play the plan out. There is so often that we come into a situation that we have just sat down and made out a ten-year plan. We have a change of personnel within the management, and all of a sudden, there is a new direction, and you're back to square one again, instead of going from square one to square two. These people said that it took eight years of their time to get to where they are now,

and they're still not where they want to be. How can we as a ranching industry continue to go in a positive direction if we're changing the ground rules every one or two years? I would like to again welcome you, and thank you for your time today. (Applause)

BRUCE BABBITT: Just a couple of thoughts on those two points. We spent a lot of time with the Forest Service talking about how it is we gradually converge toward a day when, ideally a rancher with permits on both Forest Service in the summer upland, and the BLM frequently in the ... or the winter seasons in the lowland could actually operate under a single permit with a single set of conditions. Because it really fits some of the discussion that we were having up here about thinking of these issues on a watershed basis. We're going to draft these regulations to encourage that kind of movement across fence and boundary lines by inviting the Forest Service to work with us jointly in areas where it makes sense. And even to set up a common resource advisory council that would cross-district and a national forest boundary in the areas where that's possible.

Dean Bibbes here in Oregon has already started in that direction with a plan whereby there is now a joint management of a BLM District and a National Forest. Some guy picked me up today wearing a hat, half of which was a BLM hat, and the other half was of the Forest Service cap. And I thought, they're getting the idea.

With respect to playing out the plan, I understand the difficulties when changes come with the rotation of personnel. And I would just say that to the extent that we can begin buying in these consensus local groups, I think you can see that that's going to give you a very strong foundation against which the changes in personnel may be less disruptive because there will really be a center of gravity in that community that we can use as a starting point to work from.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. I'm going to call three more names, and while those folks are making their way to the microphones, I'm going to read a statement, and Secretary Babbitt, if you have a response to this statement why you're obviously invited to make the response. The next three speakers in order are Minerva Soucie, Jack Shipley, and John Bishop. And while those folks are making their way to the mike, this statement I will read. Man is obviously overusing land, water, and trees, as well as fossil fuel and minerals. Can we save something for other species in future

generations?

BRUCE BABBITT: I think the answer from everyone on this stage, from over there, all the way over here, is yes. There is room in western ecosystems for sustainable long-term inter-generational use in the context of healthy rangeland ecosystems, which involve people and a balanced environment on a long-term basis. The answer is yes.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. I'd like to make a comment here just for the benefit of the microphone usage. We're having a little trouble picking up some folks, so be as close to the microphone as you can be, and that way we can hear. Minerva, you're next.

MINERVA SOUCIE: My name is Minerva Soucie; I'm a member of the Burns Paiute Tribe. And I've been listening and looking at the makeup of the group up there. My question is to the group: have you invited or have you asked members of the different Indian Tribes to be a part of your organization, or are there plans in the future to do that? Because Indian people have a lot of concerns with management also of the land. Because of our traditional areas where we go to gather our foodstuffs, to gathering our baskets material.

Our tribe is a very small tribe, but we, our ancestral grounds was all of Harney County, all of Grant County, and in through Crook County. But today, because our tribe is so small, our land base is so small; we have to depend on gathering our food, our native foods, from the federal land. And we have been working in cooperation with the BLM to set aside some root gathering grounds so that our people can go and gather those on a yearly basis. And I think that there are other Indian tribes in the State of Oregon that are concerned with cattle, because a lot of the areas where they turn out the cattle it's before we go out to gather our roots. And so we're concerned because the cattle do go out there and eat the roots, too. Thank you.

CAL COLE: Bill, let me very quickly respond, because she did ask a question. And I think that OWIC, and I don't think anybody is going to disagree with me, that yes, we are interested, we have not had a Native American that I recall as a member of OWIC. Our description of community interest definitely includes all Native Americans, or anybody who is interested. Most definitely you should be there.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you, Cal. Dean, would you like to comment?

DEAN BIBLES: Yes, I think as, if we can define these watersheds or provinces, and that then clearly gives a place that the tribes can know that this is an area of interest, that they have traditional use, or ceded use that they have an interest, or the water coming from that land provides benefits to them. And I think that is going to be one of the key areas that will allow, so that we are not talking about the entire world, that some of the smaller tribes just can't always participate.

But if we do define those areas, and yes, I think the other thing is that Secretary Babbitt has given all of us in Interior some fairly clear instructions about recognizing and working on the government-to-government relationship with the tribes. And we're really having to get up to speed internally so that we understand exactly how we deal with that. And I think all the other groups will too. Thank you, and thank you for your comment.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you, Dean. I'm going to identify three additional speakers. We have two already identified. You can just be getting ready. Next, we're going to hear from Jack Shipley, John Bishop, Buck Taylor, Bob Skinner, and, since I didn't give Bob Skinner Sr. a card, I'm thinking it might be Bob Skinner Jr., and Lillian, I believe it is, Maynard. So, Mr. Shipley.

JACK SHIPLEY: Yeah, I'm Jack Shipley with the Applegate Watershed Partnership in Southwest Oregon. I live in the Applegate Valley, and so I'm a long ways from home. But I was invited here by Ken Bentz to participate. And I'm really excited, and thank you very much for coming to rural America. I think the answers are out here.

I would like to applaud the OWIC group in terms of the kinds of issues that you brought up today, and to reiterate a number of those that you said, and a number of things that are happening in Southwest Oregon. These grassroots movements are popping up everywhere. I think they are the answers to the future, or at least one of the answers to the future.

We have the Quincy Library Group in Northeast California that are also moving in the same direction. Critical issues, grassroots, bottom up is important, flexibility, this adaptive management concepts are critically important. Diversity of interest groups is very important. Somebody on the OWIC group said today, support from the top for process at the bottom, is critically important.

Build on the common ground, one size does not fit all, we need to have --- as Dean Bibler has said, support, the kinds of things you're talking about on the province level are critically important, and these standards and guidelines need to be developed for each of the specific areas. Again, not one size fits all. Play to the participant's strength.

I think as the Clinton administration has talked about rebuilding government, I think what is happening here with the OWIC group, with the Applegate group in Southwest Oregon, and the Quincy people, is that process has begun. The people in the, in rural America, we do have some of the answers. Thank you again for coming. (Applause)

BRUCE BABBITT: I appreciate those suggestions. We were down in the Applegate Valley early last year. And it was an especially interesting experience for me, because what I got to see was the application of these principles, in a basically non-rangeland, much more timber-oriented setting. And to me it simply confirms that one; this phenomenon is something really deep and powerful that's happening all over the West. And it is, I think, got universal meaning for the way we do business, and relate to the federal government, whether we're dealing with timber, or mineral resources, or grazing, or whatever.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. Next, we'll hear from John Bishop.

JOHN BISHOP: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to relinquish my time to Mack Birkmaier, the President of the Oregon Cattleman's Association. May I do that?

BILL PIERATT: Within the limits of two minutes, I'll permit that this time.

JOHN BISHOP: Thank you.

MACK BIRKMAIER: Secretary Babbitt, I didn't come three hundred miles, I guess really to brag on you, but ---

BRUCE BABBITT: That would be a dangerous pastime.

MACK BIRKMAIER: But I do want to give you credit where credit is due. We invited you to Baker awhile back, and you came and you listened, and I think you're changing your mind on a few things. You've stated that you're willing to listen to grassroots people, and that's what I offered you at Baker was my 43 years' experience running on the Forest Service land. And if you'll remember

the two things that I was dwelling on that day to be a successful steward of that land, and a good steward, is my tenure, the ability to have that permit year after year, and a reasonable fee. And as I understand it, your tenure item from being stripped from a ten year permit maybe to a one year, or a three year, or a five year at the discretion of a range con, as I understand it you've shelved that and you're staying with the ten-year permit.

BRUCE BABBITT: Yes sir, I listened to you that day. And about an hour later the sky parted.

(Laughter) Over the Steens Mountain, and it said ten years. (Applause)

MACK BIRKMAIER: Thank you. I wanted to mention that the other thing, you know, maybe I mentioned to you, it's kind of like a double-barreled shotgun, and the other barrel now, Mr. Secretary, is the grazing fee. Now I can just zero in on that now. I hope you understand that there is many costs that aren't being measured in cost studies of late. We're dealing in many areas of Oregon with the Endangered Species Act.

In my particular community, we're dealing with the Chinook salmon. And I hope you recognize that to stay on these allotments, and do the things that's required in the Endangered Species Act, all of the costs incurred of more riparian fence, more riding, a harder job, more water developments, pushing cattle off of sensitive places, all raise our cost. Also, the cattle that we are running on those ranges, be aware that a lot of the better ground is going to be protected. The creek bottoms, we're not going to be able to stay on there and get the grass. The easy ground is being fenced off, and so we're going to have to utilize out there the rougher, tougher stuff as we leave those areas. And so, you should understand that our gains are going to suffer, while our costs go up.

The other thing that I want you to be aware of when you set that grazing fee is that we have a tolerance for some wildlife on our lands. The deer and the elk feed on our private grounds. Many of us provide a lot of feed in that way. And certainly as the feed goes higher, if you raise it, our tolerance level is going to go down. Because we're going to --- (Applause) There is several fee studies that the livestock industry is aware of, and I'm sure you are too. The Pepperdine Study in Montana, the New Mexico State University Study in New Mexico, and your own Department of

Interior Study in 1992, that almost conclusively shows that we aren't paying too little for our AUM's out there.

There is one other little item that's not measured in cost studies, and that's who's the guy that buys the ranch out next to you now on these joint allotments, community allotments where you've got the doctors, lawyers, people that wear tennis shoes and carry clipboards, and wear funny hats. Some of them can't saddle their own horse, and they move onto this allotment with you, and guys like me carry those fellows. We take care of their cattle, they come along, they try to learn. Some of them don't have any ability; they haven't passed any competency test at all, but they're my partner all summer long. (Laughter) (Applause)

Now, I wanted to mention Bob Armstrong going across there. I saw him down there --- he may recognize me now; I don't know if he does or not. But he was down at Reno at the NCA Convention, and I saw this old cowboy kind of down on his luck with a briefcase and a black hat crammed on his head. And I just thought that's what he was, was just kind of an out of luck cowboy, but he wound up speaking to us in the federal lands committee that next day. And I posed him some of these things that I'm posing to you. So if he was any good at his job, he'd have you all primed up now so you know what to do. (Laughter) (Applause) I'm sure I've used my two minutes, but I could talk for thirty.

BRUCE BABBITT: Let me tell you something about Bob Armstrong. Even though he is a Texan, he has some pretty good insights and a lot of wise things to say. He's been very much my partner in all of this process. He really is a cowboy, although I've got to tell you he's got the smallest ranch of any Texan I've ever dealt with. But I've personally, before I hired him, I thought I had better make sure this was going to work out okay, and I actually went down there and walked his spread with him and kind of looked at it. And said, "Yeah, I think Bob Armstrong's ranch will qualify for my incentive fee." But then I turned around, and there is a wildlife refuge right next to it. And I said, "Bob, as a condition of having the privilege of coming to Washington, I think you ought to donate your ranch to the Fish and Wildlife Service." (Laughter)

BOB ARMSTRONG: I haven't taken him up on that yet.

BILL PIERATT: Is Buck Taylor here?

BUCK TAYLOR: Mr. Secretary, once again, welcome to Oregon. And of course, I'm following Birkmaier again like always, so I'm going to have to cut mine short, because every time I follow him, he's used up mine, too. Anyway, I'm not going to give you the previous questions that I had for you. You have in your hand a letter from the Oregon Cattlemen's Association. Most of the people in this room have been exposed to the contents of that letter, or to the goals and objectives of that letter. And my question to you is simple: since I signed that, I want to know what you think of it.

BRUCE BABBITT: Okay, here we go. I read this on the way in, it's got a first paragraph, which says Oregon Ecosystem Goals, and you've got four of them listed out. And they, in fact, bear a striking similarity to the four in number goals that we are now drafting and reworking. And I think it must be by, you know, maybe the skies are parting again. I'll just read these briefly for those of you who have not seen them.

- A. Develop a consensus-based, diverse interest ecosystem management program.
- B. Manage land and land use in an ecologically sustainable manner. Doc, are you with us still?
- C.

DOC HATFIELD: And are you real clear that's not a standard and guideline, that's a goal?

BRUCE BABBITT: (Laughter) Okay, looks like another term may be falling out of my vocabulary west of the Missouri River. Okay. Manage land and land use in an economically beneficial manner. And four, meet the legal requirements of land and water management and planning.

I'd say that's a mighty good cut, so the answer is yes, I've read and I'm listening.

BUCK TAYLOR: Good, thank you.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. We are getting towards the end of our time. I'm going to permit Buck to make his statement or ask his question. When he is completed and any response to that is completed, we're going to hear from Dean Bibler for a moment. We're going to give Secretary Babbitt an opportunity to make some closing remarks if he chooses, and then Ken Bentz will close our meeting. After which, we're going to have a break for you all, because the Secretary is going to

be involved in a press conference right here. And after that press conference is concluded, you from the audience if you desire to ask OWIC, because the Secretary is leaving at the end of the press conference. If you have some interaction questions, discussions, or whatever, with members of OWIC, you're welcome to stay and pursue that. Buck, let's hear from you.

BUCK TAYLOR: Thank you. Mr. Secretary, you just being here shows that you have an interest in our feelings and our problems. We just hope that you have an open mind and open ear to the situation that you've heard today.

Yesterday on our local radio, it was stated that you have the idea, I was going to say local advisory boards, but you have the concept of community advisory boards, and the way I understood it, it was to be made up of one third governmental officials, if I'm wrong please correct me, one third multiple use users, and one third environmental sector. I feel that that is a step in the right direction, of course, having these community advisory boards, but I would hope that the actual users of the range would have a larger input than just one-third.

I am also concerned about the National Biological Survey. It is my understanding that \$160,000,000 has been approved, and there is more or less a blank check given to you to do with as you wish. There has been no guidelines set for this survey, and what I have read and heard, it's really an infringement on some private property owners' rights. If the private sector could have some input into this survey, I would wish that this would happen. And especially with \$160,000,000 being appropriated in such physical restraining times as now, it seems like maybe another agency really isn't needed, and this possibly should just go. Thank you.

BRUCE BABBITT: Well, let me tell you about the \$160,000,000. All but about ten million dollars of it is to continue research programs that have been in effect for a long time. Among those research programs is a major effort to get rid of the zebra mussel, which is destroying fisheries up the St. Lawrence River, across the Great Lakes, all the way down the Mississippi River Valley. It is an exotic invader, which, unless we can figure out some way to get it under control, will be in the rivers of Oregon before the end of this century.

Those ongoing programs include efforts to deal with the leafy spurge and a variety of other

weeds, which are now infesting western rangelands. Those programs include a long going and very successful effort to reintroduce and preserve waterfowl, ducks and geese across the North American flyway. It includes the operation of the fish hatcheries, many of the fish hatcheries up and down the Columbia and Snake River systems. It includes the operation of a big research program for commercial fish in the development of new species of commercial fish, particularly in the South.

We have been deeply involved in all kinds of research that relate to bacterial invaders, all kinds of viral agents that affect not only livestock and landscape, but wildlife of all kinds. So, I simply reject the idea with the characterization that you put out. That's deliberately misleading, and a false propaganda being put out by people who I think are probably out to destroy the research programs of the Department of the Interior that have been going on and benefiting the citizens of Oregon stockmen, and people all over the United States.

There is a small increase to move some research in new directions, it's about ten million dollars, maybe a little more, maybe fifteen, eighteen, twenty million out of that. And we're moving that to try to help protect the resource base of the United States. Much of that money is going into attempting to see if we can get a handle on these endangered species issues before they become train wrecks.

The reason that we've had such incredible problems in the forests of Oregon and Washington, is because in the previous administration they simply ignored these problems. And just let the train wreck occur, and let the federal court step in and bring everything to a halt. I'm absolutely confident we can do a much better job of that. Whether it's with the salmon in the Columbia River, whether it is with the endangered species that are now present on some of the western rangelands, if we can get in and figure out how to develop management solutions before the judges move in, I think that's money well spent.

DAVID MOSKOWITZ: Oregon Trout supports that wholeheartedly, Secretary Babbitt.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. Next we're going to hear a wrap-up from Dean Bibbes, followed by Secretary Babbitt, your opportunity to make some closing remarks, and then Ken Bentz will close the meeting out. Dean.

DEAN BIBLES: Thank you. I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank OWIC, Harney County, the community for --- and to Mike Green and the Burns BLM people who have worked so hard to put all of this together. To host this meeting, as the dates continued to change, and the times, and everybody really just threw in and took it on. I want to thank all of you for the many efforts you have made to change your schedules, and doing all of these things to try to host this, to bring this group here.

And I also want to express my appreciation again to Secretary Babbitt, to Assistant Secretary Bob Armstrong, and Acting Director Mike Dombeck for coming here to Eastern Oregon; right in the middle of the country that is very much affected by the discussion we're having here. And so I just want, I appreciate the time to just express our appreciation to all the people that have made so many things happen to host this today. Thank you.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. Let's have your wrap-up comments, Secretary Babbitt.

BRUCE BABBITT: Because I just wanted to say I think it's been a really productive day. I appreciate the chance to listen and to discuss. As I said at the outset, we're now moving in the next few weeks toward a set of draft regulations. When this blizzard of paper comes down in March, I hope you will understand that that's not the last chapter in the process, that's the middle chapter. And that there will after that be another two, three, four, or five months of hearings. We will be back out West to continue this. You will then have a chance to actually look at our best next draft. You're going to see a lot of the changes that we have discussed today. And hopefully, we can all put them up on the wall and start critiquing them, and improving them as this process moves forward. Again, I really appreciate the chance to listen and have this exchange. For me, it's been enormously helpful. Thank you very much. (Applause)

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. Before I turn the mike over to Ken to say his final comments, I want to thank you all for coming. It's not always easy to stop what you do and come to a meeting like this, and spend all afternoon. And so, I want you to know that your attendance has really been appreciated. Your participation is certainly appreciated, and as the moderator for this thing your cooperation has been very definitely appreciated by me.

Now most of you know Ken Bentz, for those of you who don't, he's a long time resident of this area, although he tells me he is not a native of Harney County. And I haven't known him a long time, but I've already learned an awful lot from him. And so, I sort of see him as a man with a lot of wisdom, and probably can put the capper on this, so Ken go for it.

KEN BENTZ: What a build up. Mr. Secretary, it's been great having you here with us today. I would guess you're probably getting more advice than you know what to do with. But I'll add one more bit. And I think I can get consensus on it, too. And that is, whatever decision you have to make, do it with honesty, fairness, and decency. We don't need another spotted owl fiasco in Oregon or anyplace else. Thanks again for coming to Harney County.

BILL PIERATT: Thank you. This concludes the current portion of the OWIC meeting. What's going to transpire next is a press conference between the press and Secretary Babbitt. Once he leaves to catch his airplane, we're going to have some more interaction if there are questions, so you can take a little break until the press conference is over. Thank you.

bl

#### OREGON WATERSHED IMPROVEMENT COALITION

WILLIAM C. KRUEGER (PNW-SRM)

THOMAS E. BEDELL (PNW-SRM)

CAL COLE (OREGON TROUT)

RICK ROSS (PNW-SRM)

KEN BENTZ (OCA)

WAYNE ELMORE (PNW-SRM)

DOC HATFIELD (OCA)

ROGER HAMILTON (PACIFIC RIVERS COUNCIL)

LEW CURTIS (SIERRA CLUB)

DAVE LUMAN (IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE)

MONTY MONTGOMERY (IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE)

LEWIS RANDALL (OCA)

MARY HANSON (OEC)

JOHN MONFORE (OFIC)

ROBERT SKINNER (OCA)

KATHY FERGE (PUBLICIST)

BILL OBERTEUFFER (OSWA)

IRENE VLACH (SIERRA CLUB)

BERTA YOUTIE (NATURE CONSERVANCY)

LINDA POOLE (NATURE CONSERVANCY)

ELLEN BISHOP (PRC)

CHAD BACON (PNW-SRM)

FRED OTLEY (OCA)

DAVID MOSKOWITZ (OREGON TROUT)

ON STAGE AT MEETING

MODERATOR: BILL PIERATT

KATHY FERGE

FRED OTLEY

DOC HATFIELD

DAVE MOSKOWITZ

KEN SPANN (NOT THERE)

CHAD BACON

LEW CURTIS

IRENE VLACH

JOHN MONFORE

KEN BENTZ

WAYNE ELMORE

LEWIS RANDALL

MARY HANSON

RICK ROSS

CHUCK GRAHAM

DEAN BIBLES

MIKE DOMBECK

BOB ARMSTRONG

BRUCE BABBITT

CAL COLE

BILL OBERTEUFFER

MONTY MONTGOMERY

BOB SKINNER

ELLEN BISHOP

BOB SMITH