

1690.5(e)

Dear Issue Team and Intergovernmental Cooperators:

Enclosed are the notes from the December 10, 2002 meeting for the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan. While I know that not everyone was able to make the meeting, we had a good turnout and a productive meeting.

We remain challenged by the problem of bringing folks who have missed meetings up to speed. One of our main goals is to give you a reasonable opportunity to participate and make a difference in our planning process. Still, the weighting of interests accomplished by those at the meeting are binding (both the charter for the Issue Teams and the operating guidelines for the Interagency Cooperators include provisions that recommendations made at meetings are official regardless of the number of people attending the meeting). The Issue team Charter also includes a commitment make every reasonable effort to allow input from those not at meetings.

You have such an opportunity now if you choose. Much of the focus of the meeting was on identifying relative weights for the interest categories we will use to evaluate the alternatives (see attached meeting notes). We recognize this process may be hard to understand if you were not at the meeting. However if you choose to include your input on the relative weighting of the Interest Categories you can fill out the attached form (Weighted Criteria Matrix). There is an instruction sheet to go along with it. **Please return your rating to Mollie Chaudet, Prineville BLM, 3050 NE Third Street, Prineville, OR 97754 by January 6, 2003.**

We will present any adjustments to the weighting of the interest categories at the February meeting. The meeting notes include the results of the weighting by interest category of those at the meeting. Note that those who were unable to attend the afternoon portion of the meeting will not have an opportunity to weight the interests *within* each category. Each of the teams reached consensus on the interests and the relative weights within each category and that process does not lend itself to additional input.

Our next meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 11, 2003. We'll let you know the time and location in January. In the meantime, Happy Holidays to you.

Sincerely,

Mollie Chaudet  
Project Manager  
Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan

# Upper Deschutes RMP

Issue Team Meeting 12/11/02  
Eagle Crest

## NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR February 11, 2003

38 Issue Team Members and interagency cooperators, 14 BLMers, and the facilitator (see attached list) negotiated icy roads to attend the All Issue Team Meeting.

The agenda of the meeting is attached and was substantially followed. The objectives of the meeting were to:

- Review past accomplishments
- Update project timeline
- Set framework for next phase – recommending a Preferred Alternative
- Establish relative importance of the interests that will be used to evaluate the alternatives

A copy of the handouts are available upon request.

The Preferred Alternative process is focused on evaluating the alternatives according to the how well they meet the interests that the Issue Teams identified early in this process. A weighted criteria matrix will be used to get a general consensus of the opinions of the group. A subcommittee selected by the participants will be working from the ratings of all of the participants to develop a preferred alternative. The next meeting in February will be to go over the alternatives in detail and review the preliminary effects analysis so that the participants can evaluate the alternatives.

Most of the meeting time was spent with the participants, in their newly structured “interest teams”, developing a “weighted criteria matrix” for the categories of interests (listed below), and then for the interests within those categories. **If you were unable to attend the meeting but want to include your “vote” in the overall weighting of the interest categories, you may do so by filling out the enclosed weighted criteria matrix and returning it to the BLM by January 6, 2002.**

The group as a whole ranked the categories of interests as listed below. After each category is a “weight” or relative importance index (with 100 points available for all of the categories) developed by the group. For example the lowest ranked category has about 2/3 the importance of the highest ranked category. . This weighting will eventually be used to identify areas of consensus for a preferred alternative.

1. Ecosystem Health	21.9
2. Aesthetic values of the natural landscape	18.8
3. Recreational Opportunities	15.4
4. Economic Benefits	15.2
5. Integration with Communities	14.1

## 6. Feasibility

14.0

The whole group then split into “interest teams” according to the first 5 Interest categories (feasibility will be evaluated by a BLM team). Their task was to determine the specific interests within each category and for each of the teams to agree on a relative weight to those interests. Because each of the teams ended with consensus on the interests, no additional input from members not at the meeting will be taken on these interests. These weighted interests will be used to evaluate the alternatives and to determine where the areas of consensus would be for identifying a preferred alternative.

The specific interests and their relative importance within the categories are as follows:

### 1. Ecosystem Health

Vegetation	25
Wildlife habitat	25
Water quality, hydrologic functions, soils, riparian	25
Fire management for ecosystem health	15
Contiguous land ownership	6
Air quality	4

### 2. Aesthetic values of the natural landscape

Solitude - how well does the alternative provide Opportunities for solitude?	15
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Distinctive natural land forms - how well does the alternative protect the natural features of the land that you value?	23
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Undisturbed open space with diverse ecosystems - how well does the alternative provide open space with a diversity of plant and animals, environmental experiences?	25
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Distinction between urban and wildland areas - how well does the alternative make the urban / wildland distinction / identity?	16
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Large blocks of public land - how well does the alternative maintain/create large, contiguous blocks of land in BLM ownership?	21
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

*Heritage resources are addressed in all alternatives and protected by law*

### 3. Recreational Opportunities

Diversity of recreation opportunities	20.5
Compatibility between recreational use	18.5
Quality of recreational opportunities	20.6

Availability of recreational opportunities	21.25
Compatibility with ecosystem	18.2
Proactive response to growth in demand	13.75
<b>4. Economic Benefits</b>	
Economic viability	19.3
Contribution to public projects	27.4
Contribution to the local economy	20.0
Compatibility with the adjacent land use	14.8
Compatibility with other uses of public land	18.5
Factors to Base Rating	
Livestock grazing	
Utilities	
Minerals/ mining	
Adjacent landowners	
Subsistence use of land / products	
Commercial forest products	
Commercial recreation services (including commercial education)	
<b>5. Integration with Communities</b>	
Compatibility with local, state, and federal reasonably foreseeable planning goals	60
Livability goals	
Quality development objectives	
Access management	
Sustainability	
Environmental impacts	
Feasibility	
Economic benefit	
Compatibility with adjacent land uses	40

Each of these Interest Teams selected 2-4 volunteers to sit on a subcommittee to help develop a preferred alternative. Members of these groups selected at the meeting include the following. Mollie may appoint additional members at her discretion.

### **Ecosystem Health**

Citizens: Anne Holmquist, Bob Davison  
Agency: Brian Ferry (Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife)  
BLM: Steve Castillo, BillDean, Jeff Bell, Michelle McSwain

### **Aesthetic values of the natural landscape**

Representative: Martin Winch  
Agency: none  
BLM: Ron Gregory, Mollie Chaudet

### **Recreational Opportunities**

Citizens: Joani Duford, Bill Fockler, Kerrie Wallace  
Agency: Glen Ardt (Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife)  
BLM: Greg Currie, Keith Brown (tentative)

### **Economic Benefits**

Citizen: Ed Faulkner  
Agency: Russ Frost (Oregon Dept. of Transportation)  
**BLM:** Teal Purrington, Ryan Franklin

### **Integration with Communities**

Agency : City of Redmond (Alternate - Catherine)  
Citizen: Tammi Sailor (Alternate - Bill McCaffrey)  
BLM: Ron Wortman, Phil Paterno

Following the February meeting, all participants will have an opportunity to evaluate the alternatives. The subcommittee will then review the results of the evaluation, and use those results to identify areas of consensus. The subcommittee will propose a "Preferred Alternative" that captures areas of consensus. The preferred alternative recommendation that will be brought forward to all Issue Team Members for review in mid-March.

### **Review of the Day's proceedings**

#### **Potential Pitfalls**

- Manipulation of weighting
- Misinterpretation of descriptions (of interests)
- Contradictory / mistaken assumptions

#### **Evaluation of meeting / process**

- Don't rely too much on the numbers
- Need motorized v. non-motorized v. mechanized allowable use on maps and/or in descriptions
  - Define terms motorized, mechanized, non-motorized
- Need to explain maps
- Put maps on website
- Need maps of No Action alternative
- Notify whole group of Preferred Alternative Subcommittee meeting dates

**NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR February 11, 2003**

## Issue Team Members Attending

Glen Ardt  
Geoff Babb  
Bob Bryant  
Merrie Sue Carlson  
Butch Crume  
Randy Davis  
Bob Davison  
Mark Devoney  
Joani Dufourd  
Gary Farnsworth  
Ed Faulkner  
Brian Ferry  
Ken Florey  
Bill Fockler  
Kent Gill  
Mimi Graves  
Bob Graves  
Susan Gray  
Jamie Hildebrandt  
Anne Homquist  
Belinda Kachlein  
Sandy Lonsdale  
Bill McCaffrey  
Catherine Morrow  
Clay Penhollow  
Bill Peterson  
John Pewther  
Barbara Pieper  
Darrell Pieper  
Tammi Sailor  
Walt Schloer  
Sarah Thomas  
Paul Thomasberg  
Ward Tonsfeldt  
Marie Towe  
Alan Unger  
Martin Winch  
Katy Yoder  
Robin Vora

BLM Staff  
  
Robert Towne  
Mollie Chaudet  
Eliseo Ilano  
Ryan Franklin  
Ron Gregory  
Michelle McSwain  
Bill Dean  
Greg Currie  
Teal Purrington  
Steve Castillo  
Keith Brown  
Ron Wortman  
Phil Paterno  
Mike Williams  
  
Facilitator:  
Terry Morton

Dear Issue Team Members:

Thanks for your interest in following up on the work we did at our December 10 meeting. Here is a brief description of the part we'd like your feedback on:

1. At this point in the process, we want to focus on key *interests*, as the basis on which to evaluate the various Alternatives & make a selection of a Preferred Alternative.
2. The following interests categories were gleaned from the notes of your past 12 months worth of work:
  - a. Economic Benefit
  - b. Ecosystem Health
  - c. Integration with Communities
  - d. Natural Values (Aesthetics)
  - e. Recreational Opportunities
  - f. Feasibility (How realistic is it?)
3. While we know that all of these interests are important, it may also be true that some are more important to you than others. To help us determine whether this is true, we are using a tool called a "Weighted Criteria Matrix." You have the handout, "Ranking & Weighting Interest Categories." This includes several steps:
  - a. First, rank order the interests – put them in order of importance to you (Table A, "Ranking 1-6");
  - b. Now, re-write the interests in order, your top priority at the top, continuing in order down to your sixth priority (Table B, "Interests").
  - c. The next step is to "weight" each interest; that means to assign a percentage to each interest (Table B "Weight"). Think of it as a pie worth 100% -- How big a "slice" would you give to each interest? If they were all exactly equal in importance, you'd give about 17% to each. Or you might give 30% to one, 25% to another, 20% to a third, 15% to the fourth, & 5% to each the fifth & sixth. Give them any weights that you think reflect how strongly you feel about each interest relative to the others, just make sure it adds up to 100%!
  - d. Now transfer the percentages back up to the Weight column in Table A.

We'll be compiling everyone's "votes," so we can get a sense for the community's priorities. The Interest Subcommittee will use this information as they evaluate the various Alternatives.

**If you choose to provide your input it must be received by January 6, 2002.**

# RANKING & WEIGHTING INTEREST CATEGORIES

- (1) Rank order the Interests, the most important = 1, second most important = 2, etc.
- (2) Re-write the Interests in order in Table B
- (3) Assign weights to each Interest, more to the top items, less to the bottom, total = 100  
(If all Interests carry equal weight, assign 17% to each, then take off 2% to = 100)
- (4) Re-write the Weights in Table A, in the order listed.

**TABLE A**

		(1)	(4)
	INTERESTS	<i>Ranking</i> <i>1-6</i>	<i>Weight</i>
1	Economic Benefit		
2	Ecosystem Health		
3	Integration with Communities		
4	Natural Values		
5	Recreational Opportunities		
6	Feasibility		
			100%

**TABLE B**

	(2)	(3)
	INTERESTS	<i>Weight</i>
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		

		100%
--	--	------

Note: If all Interest Categories carry equal weight for you, then they are each 17%