

Mr. Winder,

Pleasure to meet you last week.

If I may be free with my imperfect thoughts,

After attending the meeting in Kamiah about Idaho's land, I think we need to get the deed to all the land first before we can discuss who and how to manage the land. Currently we do not have the deed as the other 35 states have east of Colorado. The other states east of Colorado received their deed back so they would have equal footing or equal land rights just as the original 13 colonies. The biggest question is: Is Idaho going to be an equal or on "equal ground" like unto the original 13 colonies that became states, and alike the 35 states east of Colorado.....or not? Otherwise this really isn't the "United States" as in terms projected so many years ago.

It is strange that this has been forgotten, the purpose and "equal footing" of all the states coming into the union. I too had forgotten this and addressed my thoughts slightly different.

After we get the deed, we can discuss who and what policies are best to manage those lands that are currently and *actually, appendages to the District of Columbia as opposed to the state of Idaho whom was granted statehood*. Or, is Idaho a pretend state? When we get the deed we can discuss who or whom and which policies have the skill to simultaneously improve the land's timber production, improve fisheries, improve soil quality, improve wildlife/big game populations, improve grazing production, improve recreational use (hiking, camping, fishing), etc.

Step 1 is to acquire the deed. Then, we can as Idahoans manage the ground, OR leave federal entities to manage the land, OR a neighboring state to manage the land.....which is in reality what is going on.... "the state" of the District of Columbia has been left to managing. With deed, we can, then and only then, as rightful owner, hold accountability those who are managing the land. This was what most of the conversations in Kamiah boiled down to....difficulty in holding accountable management practices of our state. But if everyone in the room understood that the land was actually not the state of Idaho's land, but had just been included in the states boundaries, then I don't think the discussions would have taken the direction that they did, and we could minimize the whining in some cases and improve thoughtful ideas/points in many other cases to improve stewardship of the land in question.

Scott Perrin