

Notes recorded onto flipcharts at the July 23, 2008 public meeting regarding the proposed transfer of 1,580 acres from the BLM to DSL

Abbreviations used in this document

ACEC	Area of Critical Environmental Concern
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
CBRA	Cline Buttes Recreation Area Plan
DSL	Oregon Department of State Lands
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
RMP	Resource Management Plan
UDRMP	Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan
Z1, Z2, Z3	Zone 1, Zone 2, Zone 3 are designations in the UDRMP. Z1 lands are designated for “retention” (keep as BLM); Z3 lands are designated for “disposal” (sell, trade, etc); Z2 lands can go either way.

Historical/Cultural

- Water, fire protection and historic protection of Huntington Road.
- Too many natural and historic values to lose.
- In event of develop concerns related to traffic, safety and volume of population would change the fabric of the area.
- Development would change the usual values of the parcel.
- People are too disrespectful to maintain the historic value if DSL was to acquire the parcel.
- Good possibility that significant cultural resources exists well outside the historic road corridor.
- Cultural and historic values cannot be replaced – retain in BLM ownership (Zone 1 category) in context of existing BLM ownership size.
- Show cultural & archeological surveys for public review prior to environmental assessment (EA) for comments.

Recreational and Scenic Values

- Area north of Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Road has particular wildlife and scenic recreation values/geology.
- Park open space on east side of Bend is important.....Westside has Shevlin Park, this area can serve this purpose in future as Bend grows.
- BLM should prioritize recreation staff to complete Cline Buttes Recreation Area (CBRA) plan before any consideration of Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan (UDRMP) amendment.

- Keeping only corridor of ACEC does not offer a quality rec. experience – noise and scenery impacts.
- ACEC designated area is far too limited in size & dimensions. No “development” within Sec 1 can preserve the existing remnants & integrity of the Huntington Wagon Road. All of Sec 1 must be protected from any form of development!
- Too small of an ACEC.
- McGrath Road w/in Boonesborough is a low volume vehicle traffic road—it serves as an important local trail/recreation facility for walkers, bikers, etc. Development of adjacent BLM thru DSL transfer will increase traffic and will change physical character of road.
- Will bike/hike paths be replaced or mitigated? Loss of this recreational opportunity will decrease quality of life for area residents.

Plants & Animals

- Additional animals (beyond those already listed in “Preliminary Issues” handout): Bobcat, Quail – California, Pinyon Jays, Pheasants, Turkeys, Great Horned owls, Coyotes, Deer, Cougar, Mtn. Bluebirds, Pronghorn antelope, Dove – mourning, Least chipmunk, Golden mantled ground squirrel, Bushy tailed woodrat, Marmot.
- 30 species of birds counted in one day this spring.
- Protect existing vegetation & habitat by completing CBRA plan before adding more work load to BLM staff to amend UDRMP which is DSL in-lieu situation will not protect lands- “Path of Progress”
- Displacement of migratory wildlife (deer, elk) harms wildlife and public safety-hitting deer on roads. Their predators (cougar) will also be attracted to new migratory route.
- Geology, scenery north of ACEC is unique, important, and uncommonly beautiful for the area. Very different from south of ACEC.
- Already wildlife is threatened by development, give them this land for their limited pace left in Central Deschutes County. Few would develop w/their needs thought out such as “open” fencing, etc.

Other comments received

- Juniper Ridge secondary road to enter Deschutes Market Road.
- Highest best use – residential/retail
- Deschutes Market Road cumulative effects not large enough.
- Boonesborough intrinsic values ...how does DSL consider residential intrinsic values? Open space/neighborhood values.
- Why our neighborhood over others?
- Degradation of lifestyle by increase in traffic/noise etc.
- Why not deny application
- Let DSL go to Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA) and let them decide if DSL has grounds to make BLM make changes to RMP.
- DSL has to prove there is a changed condition to warrant the need for an amendment.
- Why change Upper Deschutes RMP – public/BLM defend now.

- An RMP amendment negates all credibility on RMP – Precedent setting for agency.
- 1995 Memorandum of Understanding in effect? Should have been considered in RMP.
- Lots of review by many – why come back now since DSL didn't do job originally.
- Should do Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Controversy is enough.
- Don't need to be here.
- Deny application – RMP defends Z1.
- Let DSL go to court.
- Property value loss resulting from DSL owning land.
- New land owners with existing expectations, not familiar with UDRMP commitments.
- BLM used to be able to care for “public”.
- Who is bullying DSL
- Why is this parcel so important to DSL?
- DSL should go to Z3 lands to settle debt.
- Why spend 1.2 million on RMP and now compromise original decision that was valid. Stick to RMP decision.
- Buffer ACEC to North to Boonesborough line - no development in that area.
- DSL: Residential use of selected land need to consider sewer smell in development. The sewer plant smells.
- Plan amendment need to have DSL mitigate costs/NEPA costs paid by DSL.
- Do BLM transfer lands to DSL with geothermal interests.
- If Juniper Ridge developed – more reason to keep this public land as “Open lands” natural.
- Any plans to consolidate comments – put in public place – internet? letter?
- Would have been nice to have open meeting so people can speak who have knowledge & others learn by their question.
- Where is the written record of why this is Z1 vs Z3? In RMP files?
- Get copies of UDRMP on line link from DSL website.
- Cline Buttes in lieu lands recently transferred. BLM should review process it used to remove mining rights to facilitate transfer. DSL lands selected were encumbered; perception that BLM removed mining rights. Put process perception under scrutiny.
- 50 head of horses grazing in corral on BLM lands considered for selection.
- Who drilled well? Rodeo horses. Cattle/horse allotment in RMP.
- Grazing rights – Are Pronghorn permits /stock in place grazing on these lands?
- Horses fenced in or out??
- Fences being repaired and need considerable repairs to be effective.
- What was BLM process/relationship to DSL prior to RMP completion. Did BLM know DSL wanted property before RMP was signed?
- Spring 2006 public heard DSL wanted the lands, why not considered in UDRMP?
- Why didn't BLM deal with DSL request prior to signing plan?
- Development leads to increased Deschutes county costs to taxpayers – to fund development infrastructure in school bonds, roads.

- What about cost? MOU doesn't say BLM always pay bill. DSL should pay for NEPA work. Who's paying total bill?
- SD letter by Jeff/ & others didn't address cost.
- Drop acreage from ACEC north to Boonesborough.
- Would be nice to have county pick up land for park.
- Undue burden on Prineville District BLM. DSL should consider all other Z-3 lands under BLM ownership in Oregon and prior to any plan amendment.
- BLM resources (taxed and under-staffed as they are) should prioritize what is in UDRMP such as completion of Cline Butte area plan and not spend resource time to change UDRMP.