

Land Uses Meeting

12:30 – 3:30 PM 2/11/02 at Prineville BLM office

ATTENDANCE

Ken Florey
Russ Frost
Didi Malarkey
Ed Faulkner
Matt Holmes
Clay Penhollow
Sandy Lonsdale
Teal Purrington
Mollie Chaudet
Tim Deboodt

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE

- Ann Hanson (interested in equestrian use) – stayed entire meeting. 23108 Maverick Lane, Bend OR 97701
- Margie Gregory (interested in equestrian use) – stayed entire meeting and provided verbal comments at end. 63336 Chaparral Drive, Bend OR 97701
- Judy Barnes (Sagebrush News) – left upon hearing we weren't the team that discusses land ownership. 2526 SW 27th Street, Redmond OR 97756
- Bob Bevans (north American racing) – left upon hearing we weren't the team that discusses land ownership. Redmond, OR
- Nina Davis (citizen) – stayed most of meeting. 2991 Sugarpine, Prineville OR 97754
- L Davis (citizen) – stayed most of meeting. 2991 Sugarpine, Prineville OR 97754

INTRODUCTIONS

We each introduced ourselves. Mollie informed the public (and reminded the land use team) of BLM's privacy obligations. All comments made during our public meetings become part of the planning record, including the name and address of commentors. The BLM is required to provide names upon request. We must also provide addresses, unless specifically asked not to. None of the team members or public present requested privacy.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The team had previously agreed to allow public comment for the first or last 30 minutes of the meeting. We polled the public present, and they did not have initial comments. Their comments (one person) appear at the end.

AGENDA

- Review & discuss Desired Conditions (agree on draft or add more)
- Review & discuss methods to meet desired conditions (agree on existing list or add more)
- Review & discuss draft Range of alternatives

- Discuss/brainstorm “criteria” to be applied to range of alternative
- Next steps, homework assignments, maps

DESIRED CONDITIONS

Proposed: Land uses occur in a pattern across the planning area, where economically feasible and socially compatible, to support demonstrated community/national demand

Discussion: There was some concern that the word “pattern” did not make it clear that some alternatives would involve “optimizing” land uses. Question about meaning of economic feasibility, need to clearly define which scale we’re looking at. Team generally agreed with proposed Desired Condition, agreed to move on and revise statement later if needed.

METHODS

Teal provided handout of a few proposed methods to achieve desired condition.

Issue	Methods
Conflicts with recreational use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fence livestock out of popular recreation sites. • Change season of grazing use to winter. • Don’t allow mining operations within X miles of popular recreation sites. • Move the recreational use to a new area. • Educate public on local/national value of land uses. • Increase law enforcement to prevent illegal activities •
Conflicts with adjacent land uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove livestock from areas where conflicts are likely to be prevalent, such as small allotments surrounded by many residential lots. • Site mining operations at least X miles from private land. • Education & Enforcement •
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install cattleguards instead of gates at “busy” roads. • Remove livestock from allotments bordering (or containing) busy roads. • Placement of mining access roads...? Speed limits? • Close roads permanently or seasonally to reduce use and therefore reduce encounters with livestock or mining trucks, and reduce chance of cut fence or open gates. • Education & Enforcement •

Team brainstormed additional items:

- Tolerance (i.e. people need to accept that mining & recreation are not exclusive)
- Delete “winter” from changing grazing use (season will depend on what the conflicts are). Season of use is valid criteria.
- Add “change season of grazing use” to safety section
- Add “close roads seasonally” to safety section

- Livestock water sources – provide in other areas
- Fencing – require permittee to install around private land in Livestock Districts (see further discussion on Livestock Districts, below)
- Mining -- add timing as well as distance
- Where is forestry stuff? La Pine, harvest & acres & timing to reduce conflict with harvest and adjacent land owners.
- Consider other future values (Gov's sustain ability)
- Place water sources away from conflict areas
- ID "transition" zones
- Improve boundary ID
- ID allotment areas (post)
- Educate public about realities of rural living
- Season & timing of use
- Get County commission involved in conflict resolution
- Widespread use of cattle guards (get rid of gates)(except need gate next to each cg)
- Improve signing, inform & educate
- Road closures (rec use)(seasonal or permanent)
- Retire or vacate an allotment (rec use, private lands & safety)
- Stop illegal uses with law enforcement...trespass, mining, grazing, timber harvest
- Designate special areas for recreation & education
- More adopt and open space outreach by BLM
- Volunteers to help patrol & resolve conflicts between legal uses
- Retire non-use & willing seller allotments & those that are inappropriate to ecological values
- Security fence, mining sites to eliminate illegal uses in pits
- Limit size of mining areas in specific areas
- Strategically locate
- Develop guidelines for crushing ops (timing & activity)
- Coordinate rec development in area between rec agencies, counties, feds, state & location
- Shift timing, season & location of rec use to reduce conflicts
- Using public & private land, look at how uses occur across landscape
- Resource conflicts resolve around "the ranch" (watershed health, ecosystem health)
- Flip flop allotments, use non-use allotments as "transfer credits"

Tim provided info on Livestock Districts: Livestock districts can be formed to require fencing in former open range areas. Residents have to vote, petition to county.

CRITERIA

How do we decide what is **social compatible** and **economically viable**?

When there are conflicts between uses, or safety concerns, how do we decide which METHOD (above) is the appropriate one to apply?

Example (not discussed in meeting – added later by Teal): When there are conflicts between land use and recreation, under what CONDITIONS will we resolve the conflicts by modifying the land use? Under what CONDITIONS will we modify the recreational use?

Mollie provided a few examples of where we might build conditions, and the team brainstormed a few more for the list:

- Consistent with county/state/land uses
- Kinds & levels of recreational use
- Sensitive resources, visual, ecosystem
- Economic factors
- #'s & proximity of private land to existing uses
- Importance of forage base to livestock grazing operations
- Size of geographic area affected by use
- Ecological components (current rangeland health)
- Wildlife habitat
- Length of impact
- Visibility from private parcels
- Cost factors at small scale, like what BLM costs are to implement....Monetary impacts are different based on economic scale.
- History of land use
- Current land use
- Population density areas, distances 1 person/300 miles
- # of private land parcels adjacent, full build out

Mollie provided an example

- High, med, low level of rec
- High, med, low economic importance
- High, med, low visual impact
- High, med, low conflict with ecosystems, wildlife, plants
- High, med, low imp for open spaces

The following example was not discussed during the meeting: We might look at a parcel of land and an existing use (example = aggregate site), and rate it on each of the conditions listed in Mollie's example, assigning 10 points for a high rating, 5 points for medium, and 0 for low. A score of 50 might indicate this might not be a **socially compatible** or **economically feasible** action (it wouldn't be consistent with our Desired Condition statement). For lower scores, we might specify which Methods would have to be applied:

If rec rating is 0 to 2	Change location of recreation use
If rec ratings 3 to 5	Limit season of rec use
If rec rating is 6 to 8	Limit size/season of use of mining operation
If rec rating is 9 to 10	Move mining operation elsewhere (and in a second alternative we might move the recreational use)

DATA GAPS

Maps & Information needed

Tim suggested 1998 USFS Publication of 1987 data, Expansion of Juniper overlaid with gross soil data

E-MAIL

You can now E-mail us, at **mikewilliams@fs.fed.us**

Put Attn: Teal in the subject line

HOMEWORK

Send Teal your ideas on what we can use for criteria, and how they might be used to help us decide how to choose between methods in the various alternatives. Also any additional data needs you see. Teal needs these on her desk by Tuesday afternoon at the latest (out of town until Weds morning).

PUBLIC COMMENT

Margie Gregory said:

- Need gates next to all cattleguards

- Need clean-up of mining sites, more if there are lots of little sites

- Feels much of area is overgrazed, need to evaluate range before