

## Appendix 4- Public Participation Plan

The following are notes taken during public review meetings held October 11, 2002, in Lakeport; October 15, 2002, in Woodland; and October 16, 2002, in Colusa.

Lakeport, CA  
October 11, 2002

BLM Staff attending: Rich Burns, Field Manager; Gregg Mangan, Cache Creek Natural Area Manager; Jonna Hildenbrand, Outdoor Recreation Planner; Larry Ames, Interpretive Specialist.

There were 21 public participants at this meeting providing the following comments:

- Should sign Davis Street gate with explanation.
- Would vote for proposed action.
- What is water situation at Blue Ridge Ranch House? Need potable water.
- Get cattle in early spring for star thistle control.
- Substantial area not accessible during irrigation releases. Suggest building bridges over creek crossings.
- Zone B: map looks like it touches highway (public access).
- Cache Creek plan is not multiple-use friendly.
- If wilderness bill is overturned, consider making OHV corridors.
- Needs to be a place for motorized recreation. Some wilderness, some multiple use.
- Will need roads for fire control access.
- Endorse alternative #4. Protect what undisturbed areas are left.
- Are we doing anything to manage for diseases common to Elk (brucellosis, etc.)
- Ask for data from Fish and Game
- Endorse alternative #3. Provides for most multiple use.
- Grazing is good for the land.
- Develop Cowboy Camp to allow for bigger rigs.
- Omit recreation aspect for zones C and F for expansion and/or continued level of use. Eliminate or forget the Twin Sisters trail. Trespass issues on private land. Focus money for improvement to other trails near Blue Ridge, etc.
- Regarding private property (personal) liabilities and rights: will boundaries be posted and signed?
- Grazing: experiment with a variety of techniques and time of year.
- Recreation: recognizing more users in the area.
- Biological: Is tamarisk dominant noxious species? What are other species?

- Improve trees on Upper Cache Creek and portions of Payne Ranch. Fisheries will improve too.
- Of the 70,000 acres none is identified for OHV use. Will any be identified for OHV?
- Hunting has pretty much been eliminated from the Perkins Creek Ridge area due to vehicle restrictions.
- Indian Valley uses for OHV: will use change if suggested as wilderness?
- Endorse alternative #4.
- Will need emergency road access (search and rescue, fire, ambulance, etc.)
- Prescribed burns: mosaic burn patterns effective.
- Would like surveys of other large animals than elk.
- Endorse alternative #3
- If there is a place suitable for OHV, it should be in a location as not to impact wildlife (noise, sensitive habitat, etc.)
- Would like to preserve some land the way it was for future generations. Access is necessary to be viewed and appreciated by future generations.
- Concepts of wilderness not realistic.
- Plan keeps in tune with Boxer bill.
- Will Cowboy Camp access remain open? Concerns about soil compaction near oaks. Favor barriers to prevent.
- Would like notes from all meetings posted on Internet.

Woodland, CA  
October 15, 2002

BLM Staff attending: Rich Burns, Field Manager; Gregg Mangan, Cache Creek Natural Area Manager; Jonna Hildenbrand, Outdoor Recreation Planner; Larry Ames, Interpretive Specialist.

There were 40 public participants at this meeting providing the following comments:

- Would like plan to include a comparison table of all alternatives
- Mountain bikes and water developments are questionable (per wilderness values)
- Adequate law enforcement is important
- Use environmental factors to establish grazing plan, not a date (i.e. 2003)
- Mountain bikes don't belong in Cache Creek on trails. Restrict to gravel roads.
- Allow overnight camping in Zone A
- Best management practice for grazing should include exclosures near water courses and gullies.
- Wildlife issues: include California Red-Legged Frog.
- Geologic Values: Folded formations and eroded areas provide interpretive opportunities.
- Support alternative #4. Prescribed burning in the fall.
- Look at Henry Coe State Park for plan examples
- Coe Park is different geologically and vegetation.
- Was wind energy omitted intentionally? Consider in CRMP for scenic changes.
- Support control burns and grazing to control invasive weeds.
- Fence ponds and install remote water sites for livestock. (BLM should fund)
- Grazing needs to be practical for lessee.
- Consider microplot approach to weed control studies. (controlled burns, grazing, etc.)
- Don't allow mountain bikes in WSA prior to designation decision.
- Consider methods other than grazing for weed control (prefer no grazing)
- Keep options open by maximum protection now.
- Dislike seeing "entitled" people (inholders, administrative access) driving into areas that are closed to public vehicles.
- Would like dispersed car camping to be available.
- Address minimum water flow levels in plan.
- What did the Cache Creek area originally look like (vegetation, etc.)
- Why is camping in Zone A restricted ½ from parking lot (Fish and Game rule)
- Off highway vehicles: Trails should be closed unless signed open.

- Prohibition of non-hunting shooting is OK
- Initiate a suitability study for wild and scenic designation to include water flows to protect wildlife.
- In favor of barrier installation in Zone F. Identify some ponds for grazing and some for recreation (keep them separate)
- Cache Creek qualifies as a significant component to wilderness. Interim management as wilderness – other areas for recreation uses.
- Support a hybrid of alternative #1. Support multi-use. Support noxious weed eradication by burns and grazing.
- Support alternative #4
- Keep mountain bikes out of WSA.
- Would like plan to mention other areas that offer recreational opportunities elsewhere (specifically OHV, mountain biking and target shooting)
- Regional approach to recreational opportunities (Yolo County parks, etc.)
- Projects/Planning for Tule elk: look at expanding range as opposed to intensive non-native seedings and plantings.

Colusa, CA  
October 16, 2002

BLM Staff attending: Rich Burns, Field Manager; Gregg Mangan, Cache Creek Natural Area Manager; Jonna Hildenbrand, Outdoor Recreation Planner; Frank Arriaza, Natural Resource Specialist; Larry Ames, Interpretive Specialist.

There were 7 public participants at this meeting providing the following comments:

### **Comments**

- Evaluate livestock grazing based on a longer period of time – not just the last two years.
- Livestock grazing: possible exchange of services for grazing (i.e. fencing)
- Include list of partners and contributors in plan.
- Page 81 of plan – under benefits A and B – most concern with B. It may or may not be true.
- Need to understand demand for use based on increased use being seen now.
- May be increased need for mountain bike use in future. Needs to be addressed in plan, esp. Payne Ranch.
- The monitoring plan focuses on invasives; nothing in the plan for sediment monitoring.
- Manage for mountain bike use where elk aren't. (Zone management)

## Summary of Public Comments on the September, 2002 Draft CRMP

The following is a summary of the public comments received at the Ukiah Field Office following the release of the Draft CRMP. Comments were received by mail, email, fax, and telephone.

The main recurring issues in the comments included:

1. Recommended Alternative

Which alternative, including the Proposed Action, should be recommended as the most suitable for guiding the future management direction within the CCNA?

2. Mountain bikes

Should mountain bike use be allowed within the CCNA, and if so, where?

3. OHV use

Should the closure to OHV use with the CCNA continue, or should limited use in certain areas be allowed?

4. Grazing

Should any grazing even for noxious weed control be allowed within the CCNA?

5. Land acquisition

Should BLM continue to seek acquisition of key private lands from willing sellers?

Additionally, even though the Draft CRMP took no position on wilderness designation on all or part of the CCNA or a Wild and Scenic River designation for Cache Creek, there were many comments dealing with these two issues.

There were many other issues identified in the comments which were not as controversial as those mentioned above. Most of these dealt with the need for certain visitor services, including access locations with minimal facilities, better trail system, and a good brochure map of the CCNA that also includes useful visitor information.

Most comments also placed protection of the special resource values of the CCNA above the needs of primitive recreation.

## Results:

### 1. Recommended alternative

The majority of respondents supported the Proposed Action, as described in the Draft CRMP. The breakdown was as follows:

- *Proposed Action:*  
Prioritizes protection of resource values while providing for compatible recreational uses  
25 of 36 respondents (69%)
- *Alternative 1:*  
No Action  
1 of 36 respondents (3%)
- *Alternative 2:*  
Expanding opportunities for primitive recreation and eliminating all conflicting uses  
4 of 36 respondents (11%)
- *Alternative 3:*  
Provide the widest range of recreational opportunities, while allowing other uses that do not detract from the recreational experience  
1 of 36 respondents (3%)
- *Alternative 4:*  
Provide the most stringent protection of resource values while minimizing any increase in recreational use  
5 of 36 respondents (14%)

### 2. Mountain bikes

The use of mountain bikes within the CCNA was one of two issues considered a “hot button” item for comments.

Respondents were clearly split among those supporting wilderness designation for the CCNA and mountain biking advocates. Those advocating wilderness generally supported a total ban on mountain bike use on any BLM land proposed for wilderness designation or a potential wilderness area, as described in the California Wild Heritage Act of 2003.

Mountain biking advocates supported the position of allowing their favored activity to occur, sharing trails with other users especially in locations such as the WSA and Payne Ranch where there are many old jeep trails suitable for biking.

31 of 43 respondents (72%) supported a total ban on mountain bikes on those BLM lands described above, while 12 of 43 (28%) supported allowing mountain bikes within the WSA and the Payne Ranch.

3. OHV use

Retaining a total vehicle closure for the CCNA had strong support. The closure was endorsed by 45 of 53 respondents (85%). Several comments also suggested that the CRMP provide alternatives and direct those who want to ride OHV's to an appropriate area outside of the CCNA.

Proponents of OHV use for the most part advocated a limited use, rationalizing that somewhere in the 72,000-acre CCNA there must be some location where members of local communities could ride dirt bikes or ATV's.

4. Grazing

Grazing was the second "hot button" issue during the public comment process. Those opposing grazing generally preferred a total ban on any use of livestock, even prescribed grazing specifically for exotic weed control. The general consensus was that livestock would cause resource damage despite strict controls, and weed control could be better accomplished by methods other than through the use of grazing animals.

Those favoring grazing primarily advocated the use of livestock as a tool for controlling the spread of noxious weeds under carefully prescribed conditions. There was one comment advocating grazing under the general conditions of a typical BLM lease to support the local livestock industry.

Of those responding, 29 of 38 (76%) favored a total ban on all grazing. Those favoring grazing for weed control included 9 of 38 (24%) respondents.

5. Land acquisition

There was significant support for BLM continuing with the present policy of working with willing sellers to acquire additional high quality habitat and other lands important for access and other recreational values.

Of those responding, 20 of 21 supported the BLM's current policy. The one opposed to any further acquisition stated that "unwilling sellers can be turned into willing sellers" by limitations on their property caused by surrounding BLM land.

Additionally there were many comments for Wilderness and Wild and Scenic River designations for the CCNA, even though this was not part of the Proposed Action of the Draft CRMP.

35 of 40 respondents (88%) favored a wilderness designation for those BLM lands described in the California Wild Heritage Act of 2003. Proponents felt that it was necessary to give these lands the ultimate protection in order to prevent any future development, particularly related to energy and minerals. Those opposed felt that wilderness designation was unnecessary and too restrictive.

Wild and scenic river status for Cache Creek was advocated by 25 of 30 respondents (83%). The consensus among proponents was that Cache Creek is such a sensitive resource that it needed the ultimate protection to preserve its many outstandingly remarkable values. Opponents to wild and scenic river status felt that this designation could potentially affect water deliveries for agricultural purposes.