

Land Ownership Issue Team

2:00 - 5:00 pm, February 1, 2002

Eagle Crest, the Board Room

Members Present: Jamie Hildebrandt, Anne Homquist, Kate Kimball, John Pewther, Darsie Strome, Kerrie Wallace, Mimi Graves, Barbara Pieper, Martin Winch, and Ron Wortman

Members Absent: Catherine Morrow, Alan Van Vliet, Terry Eccles,

Others Present: Mollie Chaudet, Major Bill McCaffrey from the military, Mimi Blakely (?) a guest, Mike Calihan (?) a guest, and another visitor.

Meetings and Other Scheduled Items:

1. The fourth meeting of the Lands Ownership Issue Team will be held on **Wednesday, March 13, 2002 from 2 to 5pm at Rock Springs.**
2. The team agreed to use e-mail (primarily), phone, and post to remain in contact between meetings. *BLM does not have e-mail capabilities. Other e-mail alternatives are being explored; the Forest Service will create a space for BLM. BLM will communicate via phone and post.*
3. Several of the team members indicated that a field trip may be timely.

Assignments and Requests:

1. Interaction with other teams is beginning. The information, requests, suggestions they provide should be considered within the context of our goals and desired conditions below. *The team has alternatives that address many of these concerns.*
2. Next Meeting – Team members need the desired conditions, notes, and alternative maps to check for consistency.
3. Martin further refined the Desired Conditions (see last Agenda Item). Barbara mailed these to the team. Members should review for consistency and provide comments if appropriate.
4. Jon Jenings will speak to the team at the next meeting concerning state rules and regulations.
5. The Transportation and Access Team has requested that the Lands Ownership Team address the following issue among the Land Ownership issues: In some areas, access to public lands is blocked by private ownership. *This issue has been a part of all our team discussions and is addressed as the second bullet under Public Lands Issues: In some cases private land ownership blocks public access to public lands.*
6. The boundary of the project has been expanded to include an area south of

Prineville Reservoir. Send team comments to Barbara. Discussion at the next meeting as more information becomes available.

Agenda Item #1

Two new members were included on the team: Jon Jenings, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), and Tammy Sailor, Central Oregon Irrigation District (COID) and Deschutes Planning Commission.

Team membership is closed because of difficulties updating new members.

Action Items (Who needs to do what and when is it due)

1. Jon will speak to the team about state rules and regulations at the next meeting, including state in lieu lands.
 2. Tammy will provide canal maps for the project area.
-

Agenda Item #2

Team members shared their work from the assignment: On a map, designate public land disposition as you wish, including private lands for acquisition. You are responsible for the well being of the public lands. On the same map, with the rules you understand now and your understanding of public concerns, designate public land disposition. For complete instructions see AllIssueTeamsNotes2, Notes to Lands Team from December 1, 2001, meeting of all issue teams.

Team Discussed

1. Ron presented the information provided by Catherine for Deschutes County. The four concerns (desired conditions?) for the county were airport protection, community expansion, Deschutes River protection for riparian and recreation purposes, and keep buffers between communities for the purpose of retaining community identities. Retain the Deschutes River in public ownership and acquire river parcels as available, including the La Pine area. Retain the public lands between Redmond and Bend to separate the communities. Retain the public lands in the Clear Zones for Redmond (see next sentence for exchange caveat) and Bend. Designate lands east of Redmond for highway alignment. Designate lands south of Fairgrounds for community expansion. In La Pine, designate lands east of Highway 97, between Wickiup Junction and La Pine for community purposes such as a sewer expansion and airport. Also designate the isolated BLM parcel

- on Burgess Road for park and recreation purposes.
2. Jamie and Martin combined their efforts. Their concerns were to designate isolated parcels for disposal with the exception of those parcels with recognized values, for example, riparian areas, high places, or T&E plants or animals. They suggest acquisition of easements for those isolated parcels with recognized values, such as Powell Buttes. They also had the concerns that good boundaries be established (removing checkerboard patterns), only accept a net lose of public lands if the acquired lands would have quality values (this is a matter of trust, it is also in FLPMA under Exchanges, Sec. 206, par. 1), and provide for the separation of rural and urban areas. An important theme of this team was that the disposition of certain lands would only be changed to another group or agency when they could better manage the parcel for a specific purpose, for example, a local parks and recreation district developing a park.
 3. Kate agreed with Jamie and Martin. She added acquiring private lands for the purpose of providing wildlife and recreation corridors between the larger blocks, specifically a corridor from Sisters to Millican. She also had a concern that recreation areas remain close to towns.
 4. Barbara approached concerns from economic, wildlife, education/study, and recreation perspectives. She would designate lands to the best agency and consolidate: (1) make flat long lines instead of sawtooth landownership patterns (Highway 97 or BLM/FS boundary), (2) move developed campgrounds to State or municipal jurisdictions (including Smith Rocks), (3) transfer split jurisdictions to one agency (Tumalo parcels to FS). She agreed with Kate about a wildlife corridor from Sisters to Millican. She would retain Cline Buttes for recreation, education and study purposes.
 5. Mimi shared the same concerns as Barbara. She expanded the concern for rivers to include Dry Canyon, McKensie, Buckhorn and Bear Creeks. She would retain public lands and acquire private lands to block up and provide ease of management, with the exception of some isolated parcels. These isolated parcels for disposal would not include Smith Rocks, Powell Buttes, or other high places; however, these parcels could be transferred to other agencies for the purpose of best management.
 6. Kerrie's concerns were for blocking up, recreation, and wildlife (deer) habitat. To expedite blocking up, dispose of the northeast parcels quickly. Retain Powell Buttes and obtain access. Lands designated for community expansion for Redmond would be to the south and east. In La Pine, dispose of lands within the unincorporated urban area boundary or adjacent to the community and retain the rest.
 7. Butch addressed only La Pine. Designate the public lands around La Pine for community expansion to provide for an airport and sewer expansion. Dispose of the isolated parcels. Designate the larger blocks to retain, but provide for the option of disposal to block up or better connect other public parcels.
 8. Tammy opted for exchanges that make sense, to shore up or block up BLM.
 9. Darsie's concerns were to consolidate, simplify administration, make more economical, and block up. Dispose of the parcels around Grizzly and Powell Buttes. A high priority should be acquisitions for the purpose of deer crossings between large blocks.
 10. Anne shared the concerns of the team. She emphasized that the team consider the work

- of the other teams, comparing and coordinating work.
11. John provided information for Redmond on 2/5/02. Redmond proposes that lands be made available for community expansion for industrial purposes to the east, and for parks and civic uses (fairgrounds, etc.) to the south. Redmond caves transfer to the Parks and Recreation District. Transfer or exchange the substation parcel west of Redmond for community purposes ranging from park uses to industrial/commercial uses to take advantage of the proximity to the electric substation. The parcels northwest of Redmond that are currently zoned Z-3 would remain so. Acquire the undeveloped parcels within the 320 acres of private land east of Redmond and within Bend/Redmond block. Acquire the 160 acre parcel south of Redmond and east of the proposed Huntington Ranch Resort. Dispose of the 320 acre parcel located approximately a quarter of a mile southwest of O'Neil.

Action Items (Who needs to do what and when is it due)

1. Ron, the team needs maps that combine the common themes of the above discussion.
2. Tammy will provide maps of the canal system.

Agenda Item #3

Mr. Mike Calihan (?) a guest spoke to the team. He favored blocking up public lands. He was concerned that law enforcement was spread too thin across public lands, which encouraged dumping trash and other illegal activities. He favored using economics and viability as criteria for determining if a parcel should be retained or disposed.

Agenda Item #4

Martin refined the Desired Conditions on 2/3/02. Barbara mailed these to the team for review. They follow below unedited. These Desired Conditions, "what" is managing for, also contain elements that would be considered Methods, that is, "how" the desired condition would be obtained. Separating Desired Conditions from Methods will be ongoing for our team. More important at this time, team members should compare these desired conditions with the concerns mentioned in Agenda Item #2 above for consistency. Thanks to Martin and Barbara.

DESIRED CONDITIONS in format of Table E-1 (1/3/02 by Martin Winch)

For community growth and infrastructure. . .

- Use R&PP and exchange for community expansion needs to complement urban growth boundaries.
- Use R&PP and exchange to meet community needs for public facilities that cannot be

- accommodated within urban growth boundaries.
- Preserve undeveloped highway corridors between cities to complement urban growth boundaries and to prevent sprawl between cities.

For recreation and open space. . .

- Consolidate public-purpose ownership along stream corridors including headwaters and an upland buffer, to provide public access and preserve resources.
- Consolidate public-purpose ownership of highland features visible from more than five miles, to preserve the viewscape and to provide public access. Examples: Powell Buttes, Cline Buttes, Gray Butte/Smith Rocks, Grizzly Mountain.
- Preserve and create corridors connecting lands in public-purpose ownership to provide non-auto trails.
- Transfer lands to another public or non-governmental organization for preservation in perpetuity if their management exceeds the capabilities of BLM.

For improved efficiency. . .

- Consolidate public-purpose ownership to minimize edge conflicts.
- Align public-purpose ownership boundaries with topography where feasible to minimize edge conflicts.
- Exchange out of isolated parcels that do not meet Desired Condition criteria.
- Transfer lands to another public or non-governmental organization for preservation in perpetuity if their management exceeds the capabilities of BLM.

To maintain and improve ecosystems, and wildlife habitats and populations. . .

- Consolidate public-purpose ownership to maintain critical mass of intact ecosystems.
- Consolidate public-purpose ownership along stream corridors including headwaters and an upland buffer.
- Establish wildlife corridors for connectivity among lands in public-purpose ownership.
- Transfer lands to another public or non-governmental organization for preservation in perpetuity if their management exceeds the capabilities of BLM.

For improved effectiveness. . .

- Administer land ownership according to criteria tied primarily to natural land characteristics and ecological factors and secondarily to recreational and consumptive uses.
- Achieve funding and staffing adequate to manage BLM lands properly, and to protect BLM lands from abuse, misuse and illegal activities.

Evaluation of the Meeting

The meeting was productive, however, the explanations of assignments ran overly long. The

team decided to limit its explanations and comments to five minutes per member, with the exception that the time may be extended at the consent of the group for the purpose of answering questions (see ground rule #6 below).

Ground Rules

1. Pay attention and be a good listener.
2. Be concise and to the point.
3. Be tactful and respectful of other values and viewpoints.
4. Make choices to prepare well for future land actions.
5. Create a plan that's able to be implemented and will impact the community positively.
6. Team members have five minutes to provide information for assignments, comments, etc. This time may be extended by group consent for the purpose of answering questions.