

UPPER DESCHUTES RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

LAND USES TEAM

May 13, 2002
10 AM – 3 PM
Prineville BLM Office

Members Present: Bill Zelenka, Ron Wortman, Bob Wolfenbarger, Bruce Thorn, Steve Storo, Wayne Singhose, Susan Singhose, Teal Purrington, Clay Penhollow, Didi Malarkey, Sandy Lonsdale, Matt Holmes, Russ Frost, Edward Faulkner, Bill Dean, Greg Currie, Mollie Chaudet, Steve Castillo. **Members Absent:** Brigitte Whipple, Chad McMullen, Bill McCaffrey, Ken Florey, Randy Davis. **Public Present:** Steve Munson, citizen representing Native Range Institute.

Facilitator: Terry Morton

Introductions, Agenda Review, Interests & Ground Rules

We handed out the lists of interests and ground rules from our early meetings, asked folks to keep the “interests” in mind as they reviewed the alternatives.

Summary of Alternatives

This was mailed to all members last Thursday. Not everyone received their packet prior to the meeting. We reviewed the packet in some detail at the meeting.

Maps:

Old Growth Juniper (1 map only)

Ecosystem, Land Ownership, Archy (15 maps), labeled 2.1abc, 3.1abc, 4.1abc, 5.1abc, and 6.1abc

Recreation, a.k.a. Travel Management (15 maps), labeled 2.2abc, 3.2abc, 4.2abc, 5.2abc, and 6.2abc

Land Uses (15 maps), labeled 2.3abc, 3.3abc, 4.3abc, 5.3abc, and 6.3abc

The maps DO NOT show areas of land use/recreation use conflicts. Teal needs to work more with the Recreation issue team to determine where these areas would be. However, the general concept of where we would restrict or eliminate land uses is described in the criteria the land use team developed.

The maps DO NOT show all areas where land uses would be “conditional” based on natural resource concerns. At this time the maps only show areas where wildlife and special status plant are a concern. Teal will work with the Ecosystem team to make the maps reflect other natural resource concerns.

Questions & Answers

1. How is access to private land in the Oregon Military Department (OMD) area managed?
Answer: By rights-of-way.
2. Is there a buffer between private land & military use? A: Yes, it is currently 50 ft (set by OMD).
3. Should OMD use be conditional upon security (for OMD personnel) being provided? A: The BLM does not require OMD to provide security for its personnel, but the OMD does do so at large events, and is attentive to potential conflicts between other public land users at all times.
4. Is restoration (re-vegetation) a part of the OMD permitting process? A: Yes, always.
5. What is the status of livestock grazing in the OMD area? A: Most of the area is grazed annually.
6. Do the seven private landowners on the parcel in the Bend-Redmond area have concerns about OMD operations? A: Mr. Hill, the owner of the only developed parcel, has been involved in our planning process. The other owners are on the mailing list & there are no apparent concerns.
7. Is handicapped access allowed in the Badlands & other areas that are closed to motorized use? A: No. Q: If not, does this violate the Americans with Disabilities Act A: BLM is not required to provide handicapped access everywhere. The ADA applies more to developed recreation sites.
8. Are Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) use and shooting alternatives linked in the Plan? A: There is no clear link at this time; BLM will consider making interrelationship clearer.
9. Is BLM coordinating with Bureau of Reclamation & State Parks on the Prineville Reservoir Plan? A: Yes. The land use team developed criteria that will address future recreation development, but these are not currently shown on the map.
10. Are chalk & hand-drying agents the same thing? A: No.
11. Is BLM coordinating on other reclamation projects in the planning area? A: None are known at this time; will note developments (e.g., lining of canals).
12. What does "Conditional Use" mean? A: In the conditional use areas, land uses (livestock grazing, mining, and timber) are restricted to protect wildlife and sensitive plant species. Note that these "conditional use" areas do not include restrictions that may be implemented to reduce conflicts between land uses and recreation or adjacent private land.
13. Was livestock grazing allocated based on ecological condition of land? A: The ecosystem team provided a range of recommended land use restrictions based on wildlife and on sensitive plant species, and these are shown on the land use maps. Ecological condition data is available from twenty or more years ago, but there are no plans to obtain current data due to budget constraints. We will prioritize areas for Rangeland Standards & Guidelines evaluation during this plan, but the actual evaluation of rangeland condition will occur during the implementation phase following this Plan. (Steve Munson will

meet with Mollie to discuss possibility of an independent evaluation with non-BLM funding for ecological condition assessment).

14. Is tree removal limited in “Conditional Use” areas? A: Yes, though most of the restrictions will be on road use related to tree removal, rather than to tree removal itself.
15. Was the State Highway report regarding priority pit areas used in developing alternatives? A: Yes, we considered this information.
16. Is there a protocol BLM is following for the Water Quality Restoration Plans? A: Yes. Contact Michelle McSwain at BLM office for details.

Concerns & Recommendations:

- Clarify terms in the Introduction (e.g., “rural” v. “urban,” “conditional use”).
- Consider phasing in Plan, future phases contingent upon circumstances.
- Address safety concerns where OHV roads/trails cross Reservoir & West Butte Roads (A: Team looking at above-grade crossings).
- As currently worded, the part that says access routes for minerals will not cross roads or trails means eliminating routes unnecessarily (example – West Butte and Reservoir roads). A: This was not the intent; we will reword it.
- Clarify that “photography” also means film-making (movies).
- Consider changing criteria regarding high demand areas for minerals, so that areas along Highway 20 by Brothers are not considered low demand. Currently only population centers are shown as driving demand.
- The term “conditional use” is used by other agencies to mean other things, and therefore might be confusing. Consider using a different term.
- Alternatives do not do enough to restore the land.
- Clarify the relationship between shooting and OHV management in the alternatives.

Action Item -- Team recommendations on alternatives: We ran out of time to have the team evaluate the alternatives at this meeting. We set a new meeting to do this. HOWEVER, we encourage any/all team members to provide us with written comments or evaluation of alternatives, especially if you missed the meeting on the 13th, or if you can't make the next meeting on the 28th. Since we'd like to forward your comments to our Intergovernmental partners for their review prior to their next meeting, we'd like to have your comments in to us by May 24. If you would like to give your fellow Land Use team members a chance to see your comments, we'll need them a few days earlier (get them to Teal by 5 PM May 22, and she will E-mail or snail-mail them to the rest of the team prior to our next meeting). Please focus your comments on the agenda items listed below under “next meeting.”

Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 28, 10 AM – 3 PM at the BLM office in Prineville. Teal will notify Team members not present. The agenda will be to evaluate the alternatives:

- Do they reflect an adequate range of alternatives?

- Do the concepts represented in the alternatives address the issues and interests (see handout on back of agenda – or handout attached to these notes)?
- Are the concepts combined in a way that represents reasonable trade-offs? Is there something for everyone?
- Are the alternatives really feasible, able to be implemented?
- What’s missing?” What information is still needed?
- If information is not available, what assumptions do we need to make?
- Please note that the evaluation of alternatives DOES NOT including selection of a favorite or preferred alternative. That comes later.

What Comes Next: The Intergovernmental Team is meeting on May 30 to review & evaluate the Alternatives presented to the Issue Teams, as well as the recommendations of each Team. The All-Issue-Team meeting will occur on June 6, & their recommendations will be forwarded to the Provincial Advisory Committee (PAC) for review in mid-June. Based on the PAC’s conclusions, BLM staff will conduct an environmental impact analysis this summer to assist in further evaluation of the alternatives. Issue Teams will be called together in September to review the findings and make recommendations.

Reminder: All-Team Meeting June 6, Eagle Crest Resort

Meeting Evaluation:

Good	Need to improve
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawing it all together – seeing an outcome of all our work • Potential to do something great for the community • Truly a collaborative effort • Maps excellent, much information, very helpful • Members have taken the project seriously, great level of commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More lead time with written materials • Maps – Better if on one page, and/or on same scale • Maps incomplete (do not show rec and land use conflict areas yet) • Provide time to explain maps • Do “What comes next” at the beginning of the meeting • Flowchart of tasks & time line • Key words for each Alternative

Land Uses

Interests

- ▶ Fulfill requirements set out in Taylor Grazing Act regarding livestock grazing.
- ▶ Protect livestock grazing (open gates and cut fences = economic losses) and wildlife from Off Highway Vehicles (OHV). Would like to see some limits on OHVs similar to limits on grazing (season and duration of use).
- ▶ Give wildlife more consideration than just “mitigation” (mitigation is consideration but only when a project is going to have some negative impacts).
- ▶ Conduct active forest management (thinning, harvesting, regeneration, fire prevention).
- ▶ Develop human/social resources.
- ▶ Preserve private landowner rights.
- ▶ Keep public lands open for public use, and identify it as such (sign as public land, and remove illegal signs/gates).
- ▶ Avoid landlocked parcels (public land surrounded by private, with no public access).
- ▶ Maintain 1855 Treaty ceded rights of access to resources (water, fishing, hunting gathering, access) on public land (and strive to secure access across private land). Communicate these rights. [Conf Tribes of Warm Springs Res has 10 million ceded acres].
- ▶ Pursue land acquisition/exchange to maintain/enhance treaty ceded rights.
- ▶ Provide aggregate sources for public projects.
- ▶ Provide sustainable economic viability (specifically mineral use).
- ▶ Provide framework for future conduct of activities within planning area
- ▶ Some areas with heavy recreational use close to population centers should not be open to mineral extraction.
- ▶ Separate incompatible recreation activities (set aside area for each activity).

Missing

- Other tribal interests (Burns and Klamath). Mollie Chaudet and Brigette Whipple planned to discuss this topic further
- Law enforcement: Recruit someone to serve this need on a consultant basis.

Thresholds of conflict between Land Uses and Adjacent Private Landowners

Land Use	Criterion Number	Potential conflict levels, and the risk factors that can lead to them		
		Low conflict	Moderate conflict	High conflict
Livestock Grazing	1	Few neighbors Livestock grazing does not occur closer than ½ mile from a residential lot with residence.	Some neighbors Livestock grazing occurs ¼ - ½ mile from a residential lot with residence.	Lots of neighbors Livestock grazing occurs ¼ mile or less from a residential lot with residence.
	2	Closed range no closer than ½ mile	No livestock grazing within ¼ - ½ mile of closed range	Livestock grazing occurs within ¼ mile of closed range
	3	Few busy road(s) Livestock grazing does not occur within ½ mile of a “busy” road (definition of busy is pending: see 3/18/02 meeting notes).	Some busy road(s) Livestock grazing occurs ¼ to ½ mile from a “busy” road.	Lots of busy road(s) Livestock grazing occurs within ¼ mile of a “busy” road.
Mining	4	Few neighbors No residential lots with residence within ½ mile of mineral site.	Some neighbors Residential lots with residence within ¼ - ½ mile of mineral site.	Neighbors nearby Residential lots with residence within 1/8 mile of mineral site.
	5	No mining traffic past residences Mining traffic feeds directly onto a paved primary road, but does not passing any residences.	Mining traffic past some residences Mining traffic (more than ten trucks/day) would feed onto a secondary road and pass up to five residences.	Mining traffic past many residences Mining traffic (more than ten trucks/day) would feed onto an unimproved road passing six or more residences

Thresholds of conflict between Land Uses and Recreation (affecting Rec)

Land Use	Criterion Number	Potential conflict levels, and the risk factors that can lead to them		
		Low conflict	Moderate conflict	High conflict
Mining	1	<p>Not much rec use</p> <p>Number of visitor use days above certain level. And/or no unfenced picnic areas, campsites, trailheads, or staging area open when livestock are in pasture or parcel.</p>	<p>Some rec use</p> <p>Number of visitor use days between ___ and ___. And/or unfenced trailhead or staging area present and open when livestock are in pasture or parcel.</p>	<p>Lots of rec use</p> <p>Number of visitor use days above certain level. And/or Unfenced picnic area or campsite present and open when livestock are in pasture or parcel.</p>
	2	No designated picnic areas, camgrounds, or equestrian/ped trailheads are located within ½ mile of mineral access route	Designated picnic areas, camgrounds, or equestrian/ped trailheads within ¼ - ½ mile of mineral access route	Designated picnic areas, camgrounds, or equestrian/ped trailheads within ¼ mile of mineral access route
	3	No designated trail (motor or non-motor) crossing any part of a mineral access route.	Designated trail (motor or non-motor) crosses mineral access route, and there are 10 – 50 trucks/day.	Designated trail (motor or non-motor) crosses part of a mineral access route, and there are 50 or more trucks/day.

The next two need to be factored in somehow...

<p>Social</p> <p>Plant gathering, Traditional cultural activities</p>	No plants mapped in pasture or parcel, or no livestock grazing during critical times. Mapped area = plants of concern present, and traditionally collected here by tribe. Critical times are from when plant begins growth (mid March) until end of gathering time (end of May).	Plants mapped in area and may be grazed by livestock during critical times period.	Plants are in area, and are grazed by livestock every year during some part of the critical
--	--	--	---

<p>Social</p> <p>Future potential of rec and other uses???</p>	Didi suggests putting something about this in the introduction, instead of building a criteria around it.		
---	---	--	--

Thresholds of demand for Land Use at specific locations (Economic)

Land Use	Criterion Number	How potential demand can be measured		
		High demand	Moderate demand	Low demand
Livestock grazing	1	Few neighbors Livestock grazing does not occur closer than ½ mile from a residential lot with residence.	Some neighbors Livestock grazing occurs ¼ - ½ mile from a residential lot with residence.	Lots of neighbors Livestock grazing occurs ¼ mile or less from a residential lot with residence.
	2	Not much rec use Number of visitor use days below certain level. And/or no motorized use trails or unfenced picnic areas, campsites, trailhead or staging open when livestock are in pasture or parcel.	Some rec use Number of visitor use days between ___ and ___. And/or one of the following present when livestock are in pasture or parcel: motorized use trail or unfenced picnic areas, campsites, trailhead or staging area.	Lots of rec use Number of visitor use days above certain level. And/or two or more of the following present when livestock are in pasture or parcel: motorized use trail or unfenced picnic areas, campsites, trailhead or staging area.
	3	Low cost to bring range developments up-to-speed Fences and gates are in excellent condition and troughs are properly located/maintained.	Range developments need some work Fences and gates are in fair condition, or troughs are inadequately located/maintained	Range developments need a lot of work Fences and gates are in poor condition, or troughs are inadequately located/maintained
Mining	4	High regional demand and few alternative sources	Moderate demand and some alternative sources	Low demand or abundant alternative sources
	5	High Quality/Quantity material as measured by accepted industry standard	Moderate Quality/High Quantity material as measured by accepted industry standard	Low Quality or Quantity material as measured by accepted industry standard
	6	< 20 mile haul distance from project site	20-40 mile haul distance to project site	> 40 mile haul distance to project site