

2026 Current Fiscal Year Report: John Day-Snake Resource Advisory Council

Report Run Date: 04/25/2026 01:37:56 AM

1. Department or Agency	2. Fiscal Year
Department of the Interior	2026
3. Committee or Subcommittee	3b. GSA Committee No.
John Day-Snake Resource Advisory Council	2066

4. Is this New Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	11/09/2023	11/09/2025	

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date
No		

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?
Continue	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Statutory (Congress Created)

12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Committee Type	14c. Presidential?
Federal Land Policy and Management Act, Sec. 309	10/21/1976	Continuing	No

15. Description of Committee Non Scientific Program Advisory Board

16a. Total Number of Reports No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a. Open 0 **17b. Closed** 0 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 0

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

	Current	Next
	FY	FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Administrative Costs (FRNs, contractor support, In-person/hybrid/virtual meetings)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Other (all other funds not captured by any other cost category)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18e. Total Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The members of the John Day-Snake Resource Advisory Council (RAC) work collaboratively to examine or refine planning efforts and collaborative efforts between agencies within the RAC's jurisdiction. The subcommittee works closely with specialists in a given subject area to inform and make recommendations to the full RAC

on those specific topics. The public is invited to raise concerns or make comments on projects or attend site visits to learn about resource issues. RAC members share an array of insights on emerging issues, which helps BLM managers meet the goal of improved service and accountability.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The RAC is composed of 15 members distributed in a balanced fashion among the following groups and within those groups. Specific interests include: Category I includes those holding Federal grazing permits or leases, interests associated with transportation or rights-of-way, developed outdoor recreation, OHV users, or commercial recreation activities, commercial timber industry, or energy and mineral development. Category II includes nationally or regionally recognized environmental organizations, dispersed recreation activities, archaeological and historical interests, or nationally or regionally recognized wild horse and burro interest groups. Category III includes state, county, or locally elected office-holders, employee of a State agency responsible for the management of natural resources, Indian Tribes within or adjacent to the area for which the RAC is organized, are employed as academicians in natural resource management or the natural sciences, or represent the public-at-large.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The RAC generally meets 3-4 times a year.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

The RAC allows BLM managers to receive advice

and feedback from a wide variety of interested citizens in a single, interactive forum at regularly scheduled meetings. This FACA committee consists of members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior that provide valuable recommendations and advice from the prospective of local citizens. This committee also provides recommendations for recreation fee proposals for two BLM districts and 5 National Forests. This role is vital and is a required element of the FLREA.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

All meetings are open to the public.

21. Remarks

The RAC did not meet in FY25.

Designated Federal Officer

Shane DeForest Vale District Manager

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Burleigh, Glenn	11/03/2020	05/22/2027	Retired Logger	Representative Member
Drever Gee, Terry	05/24/2023	05/24/2026	Retired	Representative Member
Golden, Andreas	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	Lead River Guide	Representative Member
Hartenstein, Andrew	05/22/2024	05/22/2027	Ranch Manager	Representative Member
Hendrickson, Cole	05/22/2024	05/22/2027	Integrated Water Resources Specialist	Representative Member
Lent, Steven	05/24/2023	05/24/2026	Assistant Director and Historian, Bowman Museum	Representative Member
Patrick, Renee	10/15/2024	10/15/2027	Trail Advisor	Representative Member
Reiss, James	10/12/2021	10/15/2027	Retired	Representative Member
White, Shay	11/03/2020	11/03/2026	Welder	Representative Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 9

Narrative Description

The Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service both strive to manage public lands for numerous interests. In an effort to achieve that balance, RACs serve an important role in tempering public input and formulating well-thought-out and balanced recommendations to the land management agencies. Additionally, as RAC meetings are open to the public, members of the public are able to attend, allowing for transparency, and to directly address the RAC with specific concerns. Also, the RAC model allows for self-nomination and general nomination of representatives of numerous interests which affect, and are affected by, public lands. This allows public, special interest groups and others to have an avenue to serve their respective interest while contributing to a collaborative solution which is in turn endorsed and recognized by the land management agencies.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
Improvements to health or safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

The annual work plan identified multi-year issues and flexibilities that the agencies need to be responsive to emerging issues. Emphasis areas include sustainable recreation and fees, NEPA projects, management plans, wildfire risk reduction, wild horse management and other issues for the two districts and five forests.

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- None
- Unable to Determine
- Under \$100,000
- \$100,000 - \$500,000
- \$500,001 - \$1,000,000
- \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000
- \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000
- Over \$10,000,000
- Cost Savings Other

Cost Savings Comments

There has been no formal exploration of any associated cost-savings associated with the John Day - Snake River RAC. However, there is immeasurable value to the land management agencies, as input by way of the representatives can serve to substitute for official surveys of public sentiment related to any number of land management issues. Similarly, the collaborative and consultative service that the RAC provides as a means of interacting with the public also serves to better inform land management agencies of sentiments associated with certain groups or members of the public.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

61

Number of Recommendations Comments

The RAC did not make any recommendations in FY25.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

70%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

N/A

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

30%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

N/A

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes No Not Applicable

Agency Feedback Comments

Land management agency representatives routinely address the John Day - Snake River RAC on activities on their respective Districts and areas of responsibility. This includes answering questions associated with any land management practices or plans as well as keeping the RAC apprised of the progress, or lack thereof, of any recommendations made by the group--to include updates on implementation.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

N/A

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

N/A

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Publications



Other



Access Comments

N/A