

Minutes

Crook County Natural Resources Committee

June 10, 2026

Committee Members Present: Bill McCormack, Frank Porfily, Lynne Breese, Calista Songstad, Tim Deboodt, Melinda Kestler, Cliff Kiser, Mike Lunn, Laura York

Members Absent: Andy Gallagher, Steve McGuire, Kim Vogel

Guests Present: Kyle Hensley (BLM), Micah Kiesow (USFW), Slater Turner (USFS), John Eisler (Crook County)

Public Present: John Breese, Gayle Hunt

Meeting was called to order @ 1:00 p.m. by Vice Chair Lynne Breese

Pledge of Allegiance

Minutes: Bill moved to approve the May 13, 2026, meeting as modified for typos. Cliff Seconded. All committee members voted aye, none voted no, passed unanimously.

Melinda moved to approve the minutes of the May 28 meeting of the subcommittee on Grazing Rules. Laura seconded. All members voted aye, no no votes. Passed unanimously.

Mike moved to approve the minutes of the June 3rd meeting of the subcommittee on Grazing Rules. Laura seconded. All members voted aye, no no votes. Passed unanimously.

Agency Updates: Slater Turner, District Forester provided the updates for the FS. Slater introduced Micah Kiesow, as the interim Natural Resources Staff Officer for the Ochoco National Forest. Micah shared that he came to the Ochoco from his work as watershed coordinator on the Santa Fe National Forest. He will be here for the next 4 months. This month there is no FS handout.

FS is working on hazard tree removal related to post fire work on the Rail Ridge Fire. Approximately 600 acres are to be treated. Some trees removed may have salvage value but Slater shared timber markets are limited now with Gilcrest being the only mill purchasing pine.

Slater provided an update to the industry tour on June 2. The tour visited sites on upper Trout Creek project area, the North Slope project area has similar stand characteristics. Upper Trout will cover the north slope of the Ochoco's (south of Mitchel and east towards the Antone Ranch). The project will address insect and disease issues and some treatments will occur in Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs) for category 1 and 2 (places where riparian areas are not contiguous to each other). EA's for these two project areas are anticipated to be completed by March, 2027.

Mike shared that he along with Commissioner Crawford attended the field tour. He said it was very informative and thanked the FS and Slater for putting it together. Slater shared that the disease and insect issues are greater for the North Slope project area. Planning will need to address the challenges with timber markets. The question will be how to make viable sales. The FS will be working closely with industry to address the challenges. Slater also shared that neither project will propose the cutting of any trees greater than 21 inches.

Gayle Hunt asked about previous presentations that had discussed the Engleman spruce stands in the North Slope project. Gayle wondered if there was any market interest in this tree species. Slater said some Engleman will be sold with tree sizes around 15 – 18 inch dbh. Gayle mentioned that Breedlove Guitars in Bend utilizes this species and perhaps the FS should reach out to them. Slater indicated that the FS would reach out to Breedlove.

Slater shared that the last sale of the year is being offered tomorrow (June 11). The Pine Timber Sale is a GNA sale, administered by the Oregon Department of Forestry.

The FS has entered into an agreement with the Crook County Soil and Water Conservation District to assist with contract work on fire rehabilitation projects on the Crazy Creek and Wiley Flat fire areas. Over one million dollars has been allocated so far for this work. Project examples include fencing and water developments destroyed by those fires. The FS is working with the South Fork RAC to help with fire rehabilitation in Grant County, on lands impacted by the Rail Ridge Fire.

Slater said the FS is moving forward with prescribed fire in the McKay Creek drainage this fall. The FS acknowledges that there will be air quality concerns for Prineville during burning operations.

Frank asked about any wild horse gathers. Slater responded that there are no trappings occurring now. The FS is working on a contract to do a herd survey (count). The intent is to do an aerial survey soon.

John Breese asked if the reorganization of the FS will help with partnerships. Slater shared that the intent should benefit partnership relationships but because it is very early in the process of change (just beginning) it is hard to know how for sure.

Melinda shared that she had received an email from a resident who was concerned about the use of glyphosate (Roundup) on the forest. What is the Forest spraying and for what purpose? Slater shared that the FS is spraying noxious weeds but didn't know where active spraying was occurring at the moment.

Cliff asked about the availability of Off Road Vehicle maps. The trail systems are not connected to each other. As an example, the 22 road is not authorized for OHV use so riders can't easily get from trail to trail. Slater shared that the Forest tried to create a transportation plan years ago but it was not accepted. Currently FS priorities are timber, grazing and recreation.

Kyle Hensley, District Manager – Prineville District BLM provided the BLM update. He met with Commissioner Crawford and residents of Juniper Canyon to talk about access to public lands in the area. The conversation initially talked about road closures which opened the door to future conversations about adding more trails and trail heads.

The Flat Rock Road District has their right of way and now BLM is working with the County to make it a County public road. BLM is also having conversations with the City and County in regards to access and trail issues on Barnes Butte. Currently there is only 1 authorized trail but there are many user created trails. The conversations have identified the need to authorize additional trails while trying to stay away from private lands and potential trespass issues.

Additionally, for recreational opportunities, the BLM is working on a potential lease of a parcel in the Millican trail system for equipment storage. There is a private concessionaire who is interested in creating guided tours in the area on public lands.

BLM is moving forward with a Liget Table Horse Herd management plan update. While still a few years out, BLM is moving forward with this project. Kyle mentioned that with some of the proposed Grazing Rule updates being discussed, some flexibility in the proposed regulations might help with the process.

In regards to the new Wildfire Service, it is now in place and conversations are ongoing to assure all agencies are continuing to coordinate with each other. Some operational questions still exist. In regards to large wildfires, who will do public relations/notifications. Kyle said there were 3 important things that make a successful fire season: 1) no one gets hurt or killed, 2) the fire gets put out, and 3) the public stays informed.

Business: Subcommittee Report on Review of Proposed Grazing Rules:

Mike provided the Committee with the work of the subcommittee appointed to review the proposed Grazing Rules by BLM and to prepare a response for the County to review, adopt and submit during the comment period, which closes on July 13. The subcommittee prepared a draft document (attached) for that purpose.

Some of the highlights of the 5 page response include the BLM removing water quality enforcement from grazing permits. The argument is that issue is the responsibility of the State. Mike shared that good water quality is an output of management. Water quality is a lagging indicator of management meaning that it might take years of a new management plan implementation before any water quality attributes show any change.

The new rules include planning and evaluation at larger landscape levels. They include the move to remote sensing tools to facilitate evaluation of larger landscapes. Mike shared that Permittees need to have greater involvement in the planning process.

Mike pointed out that in section 1700.4, the BLM must now identify causal factors. Cliff indicated that this is a good thing so that everyone knows what is causing resource degradation or preventing resource improvement from occurring. Melinda said that causal determinations are very important in order to apply affective management.

The new rules include new definitions and return to the original intent of the Taylor Grazing Act. The rules limit permitting for grazing to production livestock, eliminating conservation uses.

One area of concern is that the proposed rules appear to limit County roles in planning through Coordination as defined in FLPMA and NEPA. The Committee is not in support of limiting County participation or limiting public participation through new definitions of interested party.

In closing, the Committee had no new additions to the draft. Mike will clean up some language and get the draft review to Tim by next week. Tim will get on the Commissioners work session and general session meeting dates to discuss and work on County adoption. Work session meeting is on June 24 and general session meeting is on July 1.

Melinda asked Kyle if BLM thinks all grazing allotments are up to standards. Kyle shared that allotments that are currently out of compliance under the current rules will still be out of compliance under the proposed rules.

County Planning to update Goal 5

John Eisler, County Community Development Director presented the County Planning process for updating Goal 5 (Natural Resources) in the coming year. John shared a PP presentation (attached) that went through the process. The County will be creating 3 committees and will include citizen participation. Each committee will meet 1 to 4 times over the next year.

Cliff asked John if he had a copy of the County's Natural Resources Policy? Cliff shared that 50 % of the County is private and 50% is public lands. Public land policy has some impacts on private lands. John shared that those are important parts of the update. John seeks NRAC member participation in the process if members are interested. John also emphasized that the process is very controlled by state law and all discussions to be held will be held within the 3 committees, the Planning Commission and the County Commissioners.

Frank asked about the discussion to have a moratorium on solar development. John said the Commissioners voted to hold hearings and to hear more from the citizens of Crook County before deciding what path to take. John shared that in relation to solar, solar projects can be either approved by the State or by the County. During the Goal 5 review, the County can discuss which path to offer and how it wants to be involved in the future with the approval process and the mitigation process.

Laura asked if there would be any staff increases for this effort. John said no new County staff would be hired. The County has contracted with Ann Beier to help with this project. Melinda asked for John's email: john.eisler@crookcountyor.gov

Good of the Order:

Mike shared that during the tour last week of the Trout Creek Project, Gary Ackland with Gilcrest Lumber gave an invite to the Committee for a tour of the mill in Gilcrest. 10 – 12 people would be the size of the group they could accommodate. Mike said for committee members to contact him (Mike) if there is any interest. Cliff suggested late fall or early winter as a possible time frame.

Melinda shared that a citizen in the Powell Butte Estates had contacted her about 4 dead sheep with 1 still alive. The concern was about what predator (wolf, cougar, etc) had caused the damage. Bill shared that 2 sheep showed up at the ranch in south Maury's and ODFW had confirmed wolf kills for both of them. It was recommended that Melinda tell them to contact the Sheriff's office or the ODFW office in Prineville to seek assistance.

Cliff mentioned that as a result of the subcommittee work on the new Grazing Rules and concern about County Coordination, he had reached out to the author of the "Coordination Handbook" They author sent Cliff an electronic version of book and said that Cliff could share it with the Committee. Cliff will send it to Tim and Tim will email it out.

Lynne shared that she was excited by the recent rains and the delay in the fire season.

Public Comment:

Gayle Hunt expressed her concern that in the proposed new Grazing Rules, that public involvement was severely curtailed. She shared that it included no public involvement in grazing decisions. She asked if she could get information about the current status of allotments, which ones are meeting standards and which ones are not. Tim shared that the draft committee letter address this issue of limited or limiting public input.

John Breese shared that OSU and the ARS sponsored a field day out of Burns yesterday (June 10). Discussion focused on how remote sensing was being used more and more today.

Mike moved to adjourn the meeting. Bill seconded. Motion carried by all members voting yes, no member voted no. Pass unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Next regular meeting is scheduled for July 8, 2026

CCNRAC Review of Proposed Revision of BLM Grazing Regulations 6.15.2026

OVERVIEW –

The Crook County Natural Resource Advisory Committee conducted a review of the proposal for amending the Grazing Regulations for BLM. Many of the proposed revisions are highly important to Crook County, Oregon along with many other counties across the West with large expanses of Public Lands managed by the BLM. The counties are responsible for understanding and managing the customs, culture and economy on behalf of their citizens and are the closest level of government to its citizens.

Crook County has a long history of reliance on the Public Lands (and National Forests) for important contributions to its social and economic welfare. More than 50% of its land base is publicly owned and managed by government entities. Those lands provide many important benefits to its citizens, including extensive livestock management, recreation, watershed values, forest products and transportation. According to the BLM website, the Prineville District of BLM manages 1.65 million acres of Public Lands, mostly in Crook County. More than 1 million acres in are managed within 528 allotments for livestock production along with other multiple use values. That is more than 1/3 of all allotments in Oregon and Washington. Approximately 500 ranchers hold permits for 18,000 head of livestock. Clearly Crook County will be affected by the proposed revisions.

CCNRAC was established to assist and advise the County in conducting activities under the Crook County Natural Resources Policy. CCNRAC commends the BLM for the importance of providing clear and needed amendments to its grazing management activities and recommends the County to provide strong support for their implementation.

This document also contains comments on a number of sections within the proposals for amendment that respond specifically to particular conditions important to BLM grazing management both within the County and other western rangelands. There have been many changes to the character and uses across public lands since the operative rules have been in effect for 31 years since 1995. Greatly increased understanding of the ecological factors, greatly increased visibility and interests to the American public and importance of clear and consistent rules for managing those lands requires amendment.

Notably, as indicated in the **Need for Amendments** section referring to 1995 when the operative rule was issued “Throughout this time, grazing practices have evolved, and the BLM grazing program has worked to accommodate those changes. BLM grazing permittees require flexibility to run their operations in the most efficient manner that is responsive to their business needs and that can be adjusted to account for changes on the landscape year to year and over time.” The following CCNRAC discussion highlights some of those needs for flexibility and clear, consistent direction.

COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

While there are many sections of revised directions, this document will focus on those areas of most interest and concerns for Crook County.

Section 1700.1 - Fundamentals of Land Health – This section proposes to remove water quality from the 4 fundamentals of land health due to reference to enforcement of state water quality standards. While from an administrative perspective that makes sense, it must be understood that water quality improvements result from increasing health of the other three factors. When restoring stream health and conditions, water quality is a **lagging** indicator. Recovering streams may meet the standard of PFC or trending upward within a decade or two from management changes, while it may take many decades for **noticeable** improvements in water quality. Defining goals and measuring water quality is **correctly a State** function. But assessing and monitoring the physical functions of those **measurement changes** and how they relate should remain in the BLM. Building familiarity **among** all partners is **the** desired outcome.

Section 1700.3 – Rapid Landscape-Scale Condition Assessment – The County **supports** the proposed assessment methodology. Concern was raised about **the** time and costs to bring the system online given recent financial limitations. More **importantly**, implementation will require considerable education and training to be able to understand **not** only the office procedures but also have experienced range conservationists and other IDT specialists to utilize the information and mentor newer employees who may have **limited** background in **grazing** management. Last, the ranchers who manage the livestock must be included in the processes and outcomes by which their operations on Public Land are judged.

Section 1700.4 - Land Health Evaluation and Causal Factor Determination – This section identifies and provides direction for an issue of major concern for ranchers and others in Crook County. If riparian or other conditions are not meeting standards on an allotment, usually riparian issues, previous direction was to **blame it on** livestock use. It ignored the presence of other causes, even **when there** was clear understanding it might be elk, wild horses, off road vehicle use, etc. In a number of situations, management standards were exceeded (and documented) before **the** livestock entered the unit. **Grazing** seasons were shortened, numbers of livestock may be reduced, or closures to **grazing** implemented. The permittee absorbed all the consequences.

The new direction basically says where land health standards are exceeded, then a causal factor determination must be made within 6 months, and a plan developed to take “appropriate action” ((*i.e.*, modify permit **terms** and conditions such as changes to the period of use, livestock numbers, class of livestock, etc.) within two years to address the causal factors identified that are within its control. Paragraph (f), meanwhile, provides direction in circumstances where the causal factor is within the BLM's control, but is not directly tied to existing BLM land management practices - for example, where land health is being negatively impacted by invasive species or the presence of wild horses.

It should be noted that both wild horse management and invasive species control are actually directly tied to BLM land management responsibilities. Ideally, this would change the paradigm that ranchers bear responsibility and consequences for all problems where land health standards

are not met. But controlling livestock remains one of the only control options in many cases, such as failure of BLM to maintain wild horses within AML or within the designated herd areas. If standards are exceeded even where livestock has not been in areas, health of the land would require reduced or no additional grazing; so, the permittee and ecosystem still bear the consequences whether or not permittee is responsible. Range infrastructure (fences and water developments etc.) properly planned and located can be very helpful.

Section 4100.0-5 – Definitions

Several definitions have been changed as a result of the outcome of the Supreme Court decision in Public Land Council et al. v. Babbitt. *Active use* was redefined to eliminate “conservation use,” which was found to exceed the BLM’s authority under the Taylor Grazing Act. Another revision was adding the term *production-oriented livestock* to further clarify that issuing grazing permits, for example, to allow for permitting grazing by bison on Public Land allotments in central Montana with no intent as a business beyond conservation and ecological restoration research by the American Prairies foundation. In May 2025, the BLM issued a final decision to rescind grazing permits for 7 allotments held by AP. The County strongly supports this return to the original TGA intent.

The BLM is proposing to add a definition of the term *beginning rancher (mentee)* to establish criteria for who may qualify as a beginning rancher. Throughout the regulations, the proposed rule would revise certain provisions that encourage young ranchers to participate in public land grazing to expand the existing limitation that those young ranchers must be the sons or daughters of existing permittees. The County would like to see more explanation of the purpose of the beginning rancher program and eliminate the term “mentee” as it adds confusion.

A major proposal in the definitions is the revised definition of *interested public* to make explicit that anyone wishing to participate in the management of livestock grazing on public lands must have a cognizable interest in such management on the allotment or allotments for which they wish to participate as a member of the interested public. Interested publics are people whose rights, obligations, or interests are directly affected by the proposed rule or agency action. The revised definition brings BLM definition into consistency with the Federal definition. The County has mixed feelings about this change given the potential damage to the strong working relationships it has fostered with agencies, people and groups. This definition seems to strictly apply with no exceptions as worded; the County would prefer limited management flexibility on a case-by-case basis with good communication with the public.

4110.2-4 Allotments - The BLM is proposing to amend section 4110.2-4 to limit the consultation, cooperation, and coordination process to just the affected permittee and the state or states that contain the allotment at issue. The regulation would no longer require consultation, cooperation, and coordination with the interested public for decisions to combine or divide allotments. ... The proposed change would not preclude coordination with the interested public in cases where it would be helpful, but it would no longer require it. Moreover, the interested public would continue to have an opportunity to participate through its ability to comment on draft environmental assessments and other documents prepared under NEPA and through the proposed decision and protest process outlined in sections 4160.1 and 4160.2.

This proposed amendment is confusing. Is it only focused on combining or dividing allotments or does it apply to other allotment planning and management? Also, what is the rationale for limiting consultation, cooperation and coordination to the affected permittee and state/states that contain the allotment bypassing the County? Direction under FLPMA Section 202 (C)(9) directs coordination with States and local governments within which the lands are located for inventory, planning, and management of Federal lands. The County believes it is exempt to the limit.

Section 4120.2 Allotment Management Plans

The BLM is also proposing to revise section 4120.2 in various places to limit the consultation, cooperation, and coordination processes under this section to just the affected permittee and the state or states that contain the allotment at issue. For further discussion of the rationale for removing requirements to include the interested public in consultation, cooperation, and coordination opportunities, see discussion above of the proposed changes to section 4110.2-4.

The County objects to limitations in this section similarly to those in 4110.2

Section 4120.5-2 Cooperation With State, County, Tribal and Federal Agencies and Governments

The BLM is proposing a revision to the title of section 4120.5-2 to clarify the expectation that the BLM will cooperate with state and county governments, not just the agencies of such governments, in administering laws and regulations related to livestock, livestock diseases, sanitation, and noxious weeds. The County believes this should be extended to all planning and management on Public Lands, not just animal health and noxious weeds.

Sections 4110.2-4 and 4120-2 should also include this requirement and clarification as there is no justification for failing to cooperate with County government, which is the closest to the ground representative of the public it serves.

Section 4130.2 Grazing Permits

The BLM is proposing to modify paragraph (b) to make explicit that consultation, cooperation, and coordination occurs after the BLM has received a complete application for permit issuance or renewal and to note that consultation, cooperation, and coordination need not occur at all prior to renewal of a permit under section 402(c)(2) of FLPMA, 43 U.S.C. 1752(c)(2). Renewals under that provision of FLPMA are mandatory by law and leave the BLM no discretion to do anything other than continue the authorization under the same terms and conditions as existed in the expiring permit. Moreover, the BLM is proposing to limit that consultation, cooperation, and coordination process to just the affected permittee and the state or states that contain the allotment at issue.

Again, the County objects to the proposal limiting consultation, cooperation and coordination to just the affected permittee and the state. This seems to be contrary to Section 4120.5-2 yet there is nothing remarkable that would limit County involvement. Eliminating County consultation, coordination and cooperation would impede relationships and outcomes.

Section 4130.3-3 Modification of Permits

Same objection on the subject of “just the affected permittee and the state.”

Section 4130.4 Authorization of Temporary Changes in Grazing Use Within the Terms and Conditions of Permits, Including Temporary Nonuse

The proposed section would also allow the BLM to approve changes to period of use to allow the permittee to graze up to 21 days before the begin date and 21 days after the end date specified in the permit terms and conditions.

The County has seen numerous examples where the permitted season may call for only hot season grazing, and believes the proposal is an improvement, but if the intent is to provide more flexibility, then what is rationale for only 21 days on either end of the permitted use season? Hot season grazing may be more of a problem on the National Forest than Public Lands.

Section 4130.6-2 Nonrenewable Grazing Permits

The BLM is proposing to revise section 4130.6-2 to limit the consultation, cooperation, and coordination process under this section to just the affected permittee and the state or states that contain the allotment at issue.

Same objection to limiting consultation, cooperation and coordination to the affected permittee and the state, not allowing the County as did 4120.5-2. The rationale for excluding County government in the processes is unclear at best.

Section 4150.1 Violations

The BLM is proposing to revise section 4150.1 to require in regulation that the BLM must contact the owner of livestock, and document such contact, whenever it appears there is an instance of unauthorized use in violation of section 4140.1(b)(1) and to provide criteria by which an authorized officer may conclude that a nonwillful violation may be treated as “incidental.”

This relates to a problem between some BLM units and its permittees. Issues such as unauthorized use may be written up in a letter to the files but not shared with the permittee for his/her files. But sometimes it builds a case for adverse action, and the permittee may not even know about the issue.

Section 4160.2 Protests

The BLM is proposing to revise section 4160.2 to simplify the timing of protests. Under the operative rule, every person who receives a proposed decision has 15 days from the point of receipt to register any protest to the proposed decision. This has led to confusion as different recipients may have different deadlines to meet, and it has proven difficult for the BLM to always know when those deadlines are in all cases. The proposed rule would provide for a single deadline for protest tied to the date that the proposed decision is issued—i.e., when it is sent to

the parties required to be served and when (under the proposed changes to section 4160.1) it is posted to a BLM website. To account for the time involved in delivering the proposed decision and identifying proposed decisions posted online, the BLM is proposing to expand the period for registering a protest from 15 days to 20 days.

The County views this as an important and much needed step in terms of fairly and efficiently administering the Protest process and fostering open relationships between permittees and BLM.

Section 4190.1 Effect of Wildfire Management Decisions

The BLM is proposing to revise section 4190.1 to add targeted **grazing** to the list of examples of appropriate fuel reduction and fuel treatment activities. The County **strongly** supports this, particularly on cheatgrass ranges. To optimize cheatgrass management, **green-up** periods (fall and/or spring) would usually provide best forage for livestock with lessened impact on desirable perennial species. Close coordination between **permittee** and Agency to **promote** desired outcomes is a very important aspect in targeted grazing.

Crook County's Goal 5 Update

Crook County Community Development Director

This project is funded by Oregon's General Fund through the Department of Land Conservation and Development. It was developed by Crook County and is not intended to be used by any other agency or individual.

1

Background

- Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal 5 requires local governments to inventory and evaluate natural resources and develop land use programs to conserve and protect "significant" resource sites
- Goal 5 includes 15 separate resources, including riparian corridors, wetlands, wildlife habitat, Greater Sage-Grouse, Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers, Oregon Scenic Waterways, groundwater resources, recreational trails, natural areas, wilderness areas, mineral and aggregate resources, open space, scenic views and sites

2

Crook County

- Codified in 2003 but inventories are from original Comprehensive Plan adoption in the late 70s
 - Included City of Prineville
 - Has been amended many times, including adding significant mineral and aggregate sites to our inventory
 - Does not reflect population growth, evolving economic opportunities and technology, or changes in the community's vision
- With help of DLCD grant, Crook County is embarking on an update of each resource's inventory and how the County would like to protect those resources

3

What are the rules?

- Original Comp Plan and current application is “Division 16” (OAR 660-016), but in the 90s, DLCD created a new Goal 5 process— Division 23
 - New inventory rules will follow Division 23
- Broadly, each resource category requires:
 - Identifying each significant resource based on location, quantity, and quality
 - Development of a Program to Achieve Goal 5 based on analysis of economic, social, environmental, and energy conflicts (ESEE)
 - ESEE is balanced for each resource/site and the Plan is adopted as local a regulation

4

Riparian Corridors

- Riparian areas are areas adjacent to rivers, lakes, and streams. The intent of this provision is to protect habitat but to also allow water dependent uses, restoration, and agricultural uses to continue.
- The County has existing Code language related to riparian areas (18.124.090) but the inventory of riparian areas needs to be updated.

5

Wetlands

- Wetlands are generally identified by the Oregon Department of State Lands or on the National Wetlands inventory.
 - These inventories were not available when the original plan was adopted.
- County maps will need to be updated to reflect these designations, and it may be necessary to adopt code language to require the County to notify the Department of State Lands when development is proposed to occur in inventoried wetland areas.

6

Wildlife

- The County's existing comprehensive plan includes provisions to protect big game habitat (particularly winter range) and sensitive bird habitat.
 - The County worked with ODFW to evaluate new big game habitat maps in the mid-2010s but these maps were not ultimately adopted.
- New inventory information will be evaluated and policies to protect important habitat will be considered. The information on sensitive bird species will need to be updated and existing County code provisions (18.120) will need to be reviewed.

7

Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers

- The Crooked River and North Crooked River have been identified as Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers. These areas are managed by the Bureau of Land Management.
- These rivers are identified in the existing Comprehensive Plan. Local programs will not need to be adopted until a federal management plan for the area has been approved, but the County will need to notify BLM of any proposed development in the area.

8

Oregon Scenic Waterways

- There are currently no designated Oregon scenic waterways in Crook County.

9

Greater Sage-Grouse

- State rules are in place for Sage-Grouse and the State came out with new maps, effective January 2025.

10

Groundwater

- These resources should be inventoried based on information from the Oregon Water Resources Department (critical groundwater areas) and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and Oregon Health Division (wellhead protection areas).
- The original comprehensive plan includes policies related to groundwater protection but no map of groundwater resources.

11

Approved Oregon Recreational Trails

- **Oregon Recreation Trails** are **designated by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission in cooperation with local governments and private land owners.**
 - **Local governments are not required to inventory these trails but shall designate all recreation trails as significant Goal 5 resources.**
 - The Crooked River Scenic Bikeway could be included in the revised Comprehensive Plan.
- The County's original **comprehensive plan includes an** inventory of recreation sites and **policies to support these land uses** in conjunction with recreational activities.
 - Statewide planning **Goal 8 addresses** recreation and these land uses will be addressed in **future comprehensive plan updates.**

12

Natural Areas

- Natural areas are areas listed in the Oregon State Register of Natural Heritage Resources.
- No sites on the Register were included in the original plan but the plan did identify natural areas in Crook County (e.g., Green Mountain, Lookout Mountain) but did not complete a Goal 5 inventory process (e.g., weighing location, quality, and quantity) and no specific protections were adopted for these resources.
- The original plan does include policies to protect these areas.

13

Wilderness Areas

- These are areas designated by the federal government (US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management) as wilderness.
- The original plan includes wilderness areas but the list may need to be updated. Because of federal programs, the County does not need to adopt any specific regulations to protect or conserve these significant resources.

14

Historic and Cultural Resources

- Goal 5 provides a framework for protecting both locally significant historic resources or National Register resources.
 - Crook County's original comprehensive plan identified several important historic resources and regulations to protect them.
- Inventory process will involve reviewing those current listings and including any structures that have been added to the National Register.
- In addition to historic resources, DLCD has adopted new rules to address cultural resources. The County's plan will need to reflect new State requirements and possibly amend the code regarding notice to appropriate State and Tribal agencies on new development.

15

Open Space

- Open spaces include parks, forests, wildlife preserves, nature reserves or sanctuaries and public or private golf course.
- Local governments are not required to update the inventory of open spaces, but if they do, they need to evaluate the significance of such sites and adopt programs to protect/conservate such areas.
- The current comprehensive plan includes descriptions of several key open space areas from the 1970s (some within the City of Prineville) but this list has not been updated since.

16

Scenic Views and Sites

- Scenic views and sites are lands identified for their aesthetic appearance.
 - Local governments are not required to inventory scenic resources but if they do, they must identify significant resources and adopt programs to protect these areas.
- The original comprehensive plan included the Ochoco Wayside Viewpoint, State scenic highways, Barnes Butte, Rimrock and the Palisades of the Crooked River.
 - The County currently has regulations to protect the rimrock areas (Crook County Code 18.124.100).

17

Mineral and Aggregate Resources

- The County's original comprehensive plan includes an inventory of significant mineral (quicksilver, gold, silver and bentonite) and aggregate (sand and gravel) resources.
 - The inventory of aggregate resources has been amended over time to add new aggregate sites.
 - The comprehensive plan also includes policies related to mining activities and conflicts with other land uses.
- These provisions were developed to comply with the original Goal 5 rules (OAR 660-016) and not the current Goal 5 rules (OAR 660-023).

18

Energy and Solar Resources

- Energy sources include natural gas resources, dam sites, geothermal, solar and wind resources. Energy sources approved by the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission are significant energy sources for purposes of Goal 5.
- The original comprehensive plan identified several specific geothermal sites and included wind and solar as potential energy resources.
 - The County adopted land use regulations related to wind and solar development in the 2010s.

19

Eastern Oregon Solar Siting Rules Program

- The Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development adopted new administrative rules regarding identification of potential solar energy sites in 2025. These new rules are intended to identify areas most suitable for development of solar energy and those less suitable due to conflicts with existing uses (e.g., high value farmland) and resources (e.g., wildlife habitat). The DLCD grant received by the County specifically requires the County to address the provisions of the new solar siting rule.

20

Process

- Before and during GIS mapping of inventories, broad campaign to involve the public through Public Advisory Committees (PACs) and open meetings
- Resource categories will be grouped into three PACs:
 - Protecting Our Natural Heritage
 - Riparian, wetlands, federal wild and scenic rivers, waterways, sage grouse, wildlife, wilderness areas
 - Balancing Working Lands and Energy
 - Groundwater, aggregate, energy, solar
 - Preserving Our Community Character
 - Natural areas, open space, scenic views, historic/cultural resources, Oregon recreational trails

21

Ask of Planning Commissioners

- Resolution to establish PACs
- Request at least one commissioner on each PAC to serve as chair
- Consider applications and appoint additional PAC members
- Consider recommendations and minority reports from PACs as the PC considers recommendations to the BOC

22

Questions?

23
