

Meeting Notes

Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan
Issue Team Meeting
March 16, 2004

Attendance

See attached list

Introduction & Welcome Back!

Terry Morton (facilitator).

Moving Forward – What’s Next?

Mollie Chaudet (see attached text of presentation)

Public Comments: How we’ve processed them, Hot Topics

Teal Purrington (see attached text of presentation). At the end of the meeting we distributed a 221 page report of public comments sorted by Issue category. This report is also available on our web page. If you did not receive a copy and want one, please contact Mike Williams at 541-416-6862.

Preferred Alternative Subcommittee & Small Focus Groups

See attached text of presentation as well as handout (attached) of representatives. Terry Morton described how we would identify representatives for each interest and group. Those present signed up, and we identified two representatives for each interest (a primary and an alternate). The Primary and Alternate members can attend together, but only one can participate at any one meeting. Issue Team members not selected to the Subcommittee are welcome to attend all meetings and consult with selected members during the meetings. During Subcommittee meetings, either Primary or Alternate members may participate in consensus discussions and agreements, but not both. All consensus recommendations of the Subcommittee will be forwarded to the full Issue Team for consensus prior to going forward to the PAC for final approval. Terry described how the groups would operate. There was a question concerning no representation of City of Bend: Mollie explained that Bend was invited early in process but did not choose to participate. Mollie met with Bill Friedman one of the City Commissioners. He said they were interested in outcomes, especially those related to future transportation issues, but would not be participating.

Upcoming Meeting Dates

The next All Issue Team meeting is scheduled for May 17 or 18. See attached schedule of meetings for Subcommittee and Focus group meeting schedule.

Open Public Forum

Paraphrased comments by each person listed below.

Ed Faulkner

- Are all alternatives sufficient to achieve the purpose and need of the plan? If not why were they proposed?
- The RMP is based too much on the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan (ICBMP), which focused on a sustainability concept. This does not promote reasonable growth and development, which are driving forces in our communities.
- The RMP should not rely so much on the Endangered Species Act. The ESA is not realistic and provides the wrong incentives (penalties instead of benefits).
- Alternative 7 doesn't meet cost/benefit test. Target values need to be more clearly defined.
- Historic range is a blanket zoning concept not supported by many. It leads to conflict. It makes Historic Range the norm, and use and development the exception. This is not appropriate because this area has been designated for development.
- Brothers La Pine promoted lots of good stuff
- Alternative 7 goes in a quantum leap process. It is politically correct but misses the common sense mark. We need more emphasis on job development and stimulate the economy.

Ed Moore

- Asked Ed Faulkner to clarify if he was saying a) there is not enough land set aside for community expansion, b) more land should be set aside for development, and c) ESA is ineffective. Ed Faulkner answered Yes.

Paul Thomasberg

- Argued that sustainability is important. Disagreed with Ed Faulkner.

Attachments:

1. Attendance
2. Schedule of upcoming meetings
3. Preferred Alternative Subcommittee representatives & Small Focus Group representatives
4. Text of Mollie and Teal's power-point presentations

Attendance
Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan
Issue Team Meeting
March 16, 2004

Issue Team

Paul Thomasberg, COTA
Sarah Thomas, Crook Co Nat Res Comm & PAC
Jerry Cordova, USFWS, PAC
Clay Penhollow, CTWS, PAC
Brian Ferry, ODFW
Katy Yoder, Cline Buttes Rec. Assoc.
Anne Holmquist
Nancy Gilbert, USFWS, PAC
Mimi Graves, Cline Buttes Rec. Assoc.
Tim Lillebo, ONRC, PAC
Catherine Morrow, Deschutes County
Joani Duford, COMAC
Scott Carlsen, Hooker Creek
M.L. Norton, CEC
Bill Fockler, COSSA
Geoff Babb, The Nature Conservancy

Kent Gill, PAC
Corey Parsons, OSU Extension
Barbara Pieper, Panorama Ranch
Darrell Pieper, Panorama Ranch
Ed Faulkner, Central Oregon resident/landowner
Chris Egertson, ONDA
Matt Holmes, conservation
Glen Ardt, ODFW, PAC
Chuck McGraw, City of Redmond
David Duncan, BIAK Training Center, OMD
Bill Peterson, Deschutes NF
Russ Frost, ODOT
Ed Moore, ODOT
Jamie Hildebrandt, Rock Springs Guest Ranch
John Pewther, Redmond Planning Commission
Steve Jorgensen, Desch Co Community Dev Dept

Public

Sam Diggs, Rock Club
Dick Parta, Mt. Hood Rock Club
Margie Gregory, equestrian
Bob Flint, off-road vehicles

Robert Speik
Barrie Savage, equestrian
Mimi Bulkley

BLM

Mollie Chaudet
Ron Wortman
Keith Brown
Steve Castillo
Teal Purrington

Greg Currie
Bill Dean
Ron Gregory
Michelle McSwain
Mike Williams

Facilitator

Terry Morton

Preferred Alternative Subcommittee Representatives

Interest	Primary/alternate representatives
Motorized recreation	Joanni Duford/Dick Duford
Non-motorized recreation	Paul Thomasberg, Barbara Pieper, Katy Yoder
Conservation/preservation	Bob Davison, Chris Egertson
Aesthetic values	Kent Gill, Belinda Kachlien
Grazing, ranching	Susan Singhose, Corey Parsons
Commercial recreation	Jamie Hildebrandt, Bill Fockler
Landowner - east	Ed Faulkner, Anne Holmquist
Landowner - west	Darrel Pieper, Mimi Graves
Cities (1 rep and 1 alt between the 2 cities) City of Prineville City of Redmond	? Chuck McGraw, John Pewther
Counties >Deschutes >Crook	Catherine Morrow Sarah Thomas

Small Focus Group Representatives

Focus Group	Interest	Primary/alternate representatives
Grazing	Grazing/ranching Conservation/preservation County US Fish & Wildlife BLM	Wayne Singhose/Susan Singhose Matt Holmes/Chris Egertson Cory Parsons/Tim Deboodt Nancy Gilbert/Jerry Cordova Teal Purrington
Military	Oregon Military Dept Land Owner ODFW US Fish & Wildlife BLM	Bill McCaffrey/Dave Duncan Ed Faulkner Brian Ferry Nancy Gilbert/Jerry Cordova Ron Wortman
Minerals	ODOT BLM	Russ Frost Ryan Franklin
Public Health and Safety	Landowner Hunting/Shooting ODFW BLM	Ken Florey Bill Fockler Brian Ferry Keith Brown
Traditional Uses/Vegetation	Confed. Tribes of Warm Springs BLM	Clay Penhollow Ron Gregory

Text version of Power-point Presentation
Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan
Issue Team Meeting
March 16, 2004

**The Preferred Alternative
for the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan**

The Grand Experiment Continues...

- Developing a shared vision
- Community based – national in scope
- Finding a reasonable balance
- A different way of making plans for the future

Principals of Collaborative Planning

- Represent a variety of interests
- Respect other views
- Share common ground
- Work toward community solutions with regional and national perspective
- Moving to the Final
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement- fall 2003
- Final Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Management Plan – fall 2004
- Final Management Plan and Record of Decision – early 2005

Tasks and Timelines

- Process Public Comments Jan– April 2004
- Respond to Public Comments March - May 2004
- Report To PAC on final recommendations May 2004
- Publish FEIS/Proposed Management Plan Fall 2004

Responding to Public Comment

- Over 1300 letters – 1000 + comments

You are asked to consider the topics that:

- Are the most important to the BLM
- Opportunities for consensus
- Public forum helpful to managers

Consensus Principles

- Identify what you can live with, even if not ideal
- Be honest about what you can and can't live with and why

- Nobody falls on their sword
- Focus on Interests not Positions
- Interests reflect our core values

Positions reflect how we've decided problems should be solved

Interests tend to be shared by many, positions only by a few

Preferred Alternative Subcommittee

- Government & Non-Government Interests
- Representation of important interests
- Work toward consensus on priority topics

Modifying the Preferred Alternative

- Preferred Alternative Subcommittee
 - Work on "priority topics" in larger group
 - Government/non-government representatives
 - Expertise/interest related to priority topics
 - Selected by Issue Team
- Small Focus Groups
 - Work concurrently/outside of main Subcommittee
 - May include other than current Issue Team if expertise is needed
 - Develop consensus to bring to Subcommittee

Modifications to the Preferred

- BLM will prepare options
- Balance/mix of uses that meets multiple needs
- Responsive to public comment
- Preferred Alternative Subcommittee to review BLM proposals

Desired Outcome

- Thoughtful consideration of reasonable changes to the Preferred Alternative that will BETTER meet multiple interests

Public Comments on the DEIS

Who commented on the DEIS?

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| • Individuals | 1,303 |
| • City governments | 3 |
| • County government | 3 |
| • State agencies | 6 |
| • Federal agencies | 2 |
| • Tribal government | 1 |
| • Other (business, organization) | 40 |
| ○ Total = | 1,358 |

Number of letters by state

- Alaska 1
- California 6
- Colorado 1
- Connecticut 1
- Idaho 6
- Massachusetts 1
- Montana 1
- Oregon 1,214
- Tennessee 1
- Washington 31
- No state listed 95
 - Total = 1,358

Number of letters by city – Top 10

- Bend 418
- Redmond 213
- Prineville 163
- Terrebonne 69
- Portland 47
- Madras 25
- La Pine 22
- Oregon City 19
- Salem 18
- Eugene 15
 - Elsewhere in Oregon 205
 - Total from Oregon 1,214 (89% of total letters)

How letters were delivered

- E-mail 230
- Fax 9
- Hand-delivered 967
- Postal service 149
- Telephone 3
- Total 1,358
- Form letters
- About 80% of the letters were form letters (same or almost same content, different author)

Form #1: 868 letters supported motorized recreation (also addressed other related issues)

Form #2: 283 letters supported Current vs. Historic range of vegetation

Popular comment topics

- Motorized use
- Public health and safety
- Ecosystem health, diversity
- Technical edits
- Adequacy of analysis
- Vote for specific alternative
- Wildlife habitat
- Implementation, enforcement
- Livestock grazing
- Transportation, access
- Issues we should/shouldn't address
- Trails management
- Hunting/shooting
- Special recreation permits
- Wilderness, WSA
- Threatened, endangered, sensitive species (plant, animal)
- Land exchanges
- Collaborative process
- Scenic resources
- Military training areas
- Rockhounding
- Private property rights
- Urban sprawl

Priority topics – to be addressed by the **Preferred Alternative Subcommittee**

- Recreation & Wildlife
Habitat effectiveness, open motorized road and trail densities, and seasons of use
- Recreation – Trails
Separating and mixing motorized and non-motorized uses
- Vegetation Management Goals
“Historic” vs “Current” range of vegetation goals in relation to social conditions
- Lands/Zoning and Community Expansion
Amount and configuration of lands zoned for retention, retention with an option for exchange, or designated for community expansion

Topics the **Focus Groups** will address

- Grazing (modify grazing matrix)
- Military Use (technical corrections, concerns related to changes in uses, restoration)
- Minerals (technical corrections/comments)
- Public Health and Safety (changes to criteria for firearm use limitations)
- Traditional Uses, Vegetation (technical corrections/comments)

Comment Analysis Process

- How letters are processed
- How comments are identified
- BLM response
- The comment database

For each letter:

- Identify author name, address, etc (except when author requested confidentiality)
- Assign letter number
- Place copy in Readers' File binders (available for review at BLM office)
- Scan electronically (available on CD and on Web Site)
- Read to identify distinct comments

For each comment:

- Identify action (Example: “Close all WSAs to motor vehicles...”)
- Identify rationale (Example: “...to protect soil and wildlife.”)
- Identify expected BLM response category

BLM response categories

- Consider modification of alternatives, including technical corrections
- Provide written clarification
- Correct facts or incorporate new information
- Add to or correct analysis or documentation
- Consider suggestions for plan implementation, monitoring, and enforcement
- Review the values and rationale when making final alternative selection

Comment Database Includes:

- All info on authors and letters (including all form letters)
- Full text of each comment (even if letter arrived after 1/15/2004 deadline)
- BLM’s expected response category

Allows us to:

- Sort and print comments
- Coordinate our response
- Make sure we catch every comment

Next Steps

- Respond to comments with Issue Team’s help
- Publish “Summary of Response to Public Comment” in Appendix of FEIS, which will contain:
 - Summary of process
 - Topics of public comment
 - The text of most comments, sorted by topic
 - Responses from BLM

End of power-point presentation