OPRD Publiccomment - Bandon Biota Land Swap

From: Chris Luecke <chris.luecke@gmail.com>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 11/7/2013 4:14 PM
Subject: Bandon Biota Land Swap

Dear Commissioners,

My wife and I are homeowners on Lower Four Mile Lane south of Bandon. On several occasions we have hike through the area that will become the golf coast if the Bandon Biota land swap goes through. The land present now is mostly covered in gorse. Some trails make walking through to the beach area possible, but the current access doesn't really allow use of the lands by the public. We have never seen anyone else on the property. We believe that putting a golf course in that area would benefit the local population especially if the golf course allowed access to the beach. The land swap will be a good thing for the citizens of Oregon.

Chris Luecke and Nancy Mesner
86354 Lower Four Mile Lane
Bandon, Oregon 97411

1000 friends of Oregon
133 SW Second Ave, Suite 201 • Portland, OR 97204 • (503) 497-1000 • fax (503) 223-0073 • www.friends.org
Southern Oregon Office • PO Box 2442 • Grants Pass, OR 97528 • (541) 474-1155 • fax (541) 474-9389
Willamette Valley Office • PO Box 51252 • Eugene, OR 97405 • (541) 520-3763 • fax (503) 223-0073

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Attn: Bandon Proposal
725 Summer St. N.E. Suite C
Salem, OR, 97301

November 7, 2013

RE: Agenda Item 6a – Proposed Exchange of Bandon State Natural Area Property

Dear Commission Members:

Thank you for this opportunity to present testimony opposing the proposed exchange of approximately 280 acres of the Bandon State Natural Area. Please place these comments in the record for the November 20, 2013 Commission meeting. 1000 Friends of Oregon is a nonprofit, membership organization that works with Oregonians to support livable urban and rural communities, protect family farms and forests, and provide transportation and housing choice.

"To approve an exchange that a party other than the [Parks and Recreation] Department initiates, the Commission shall determine that the proposed exchange provides an overwhelming public benefit to the Oregon State Park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon . . . which is resounding, clear and obvious." OAR 736-019-0070(4). **As evidenced by the many comments the commission has received from Oregon citizens objecting to this proposed exchange the public benefit to the citizens of Oregon is not "resounding, clear and obvious." Instead, the exchange is controversial, contentious and divisive – far from the standard required by law.**

Objections come from across the spectrum of Oregon citizens. Farmers and ranchers, environmentalists and conservationists, and citizens near the proposed sites both on the Coast and in Eastern Oregon see this as a bad deal for the state and its citizens and not as a "resounding, clear and obvious" win. This alone is sufficient evidence to deny the proposed exchange and we urge you to vote against it.

OAR 736-019-0070(4) does not contemplate a trade when the balance merely favors the exchange or even when it's a really good deal for the state. An exchange is only to take place when it "provides an *overwhelming* public benefit to the Oregon State Park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon . . . which is *resounding, clear and obvious*." **If serious balancing is required – if you must agonize over the decision or there is even serious debate – it is not "obvious" and it does not pass the legal test. The "overwhelming public benefit" is simply not there.** We ask you to vote against the proposed exchange. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven D. McCoy
Farm and Forest Staff Attorney

Oregon Parks and Recreation Dept
State Parks
725 Summer Street NE, Suite C
Salem, Or. 97301

Attn. Director Tim Wood

Please consider the following concerns with the Oregon State Parks Dept. purchasing the "Grouse Mountain" Property.

1) The appraisal was not available at the Grant County Farm Bureau meeting attended by Oregon State Parks assistant director. This leaves several questions unanswered. a) Does the appraisal take into consideration the loss in value because of noxious weeds? b) Is the appraisal value reduced because of the hazardous asbestos site? c) What is the timber value remaining on the areas that have been logged in the last 15 years? d) Does the appraisal reflect the value as agriculture land or adjacent lands with homes?

2) Has there been any data compiled on the species and acres affected by noxious weeds? What is the cost and timeline for control and eradication?

3) Is there a business plan that indicates the estimated use and what is the cost of improvements needed to accommodate the expected use?

4) What is the expected return on the investment in the property and improvements?

5) What is the value on the remaining 300 acres and home?

6) The property does not conform to purchase statute of overwhelming public benefits and/or uniqueness.

These questions must be answered and the public has an opportunity to comment before the commission makes a decision.

Respectfully

John L. Morris

John L. Morris

From: Carol Faulkner
To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Dept
Subject: Re: Fwd: Grouse Mountain

>>>> "Carol Faulkner <pandion@centurytel.net>" <pandion@centurytel.net>
> 2013-11-04T10:44:40.601688 >>>
> Dear Mr. Potter,
>
> I am writing this letter in support of a state park at Grouse Mountain Ranch
> in Grant County. My family does a lot of hiking, and most trails in the
> national forest are inaccessible to us during the winter months especially.
> We end up having to climb fences or walk through junkyards, trashed BLM land,
> or cemeteries. The only state park that is readily available is Clyde
> Holliday, which is not nearly big enough to get a good walk in. I think a
> new state park would be a great asset to this county.
>
> I do not believe that the outspoken ranchers who dominate the public
> meetings and intimidate anyone who publicly disagrees with them represent the
> majority opinion here. I know many other people who would also welcome a new
> state park. Support for the park is unanimous among the other 4-H parents
> I've talked to as well as many other friends who hike and bike.
>
> I hope the state will move forward with this project.
>
> With all sincerity,
>
> Carol Faulkner
> PO Box 4
> Canyon City, OR 97820
> (541) 575-0706
> pandion@centurytel.net

From: Carol Doty <carol@johndoty.net>
To: <oprd.publiccomment@state.or.us>
CC: Phillip Johnson <orshores@teleport.com>, Cameron La Follette <cameron@or...
Date: 11/1/2013 2:08 PM
Subject: Bandon Biota

Dear Director Wood and the Oregon Parks Commission:

Please place this into the record for the November 20 meeting in Corvallis.

I was disappointed to learn that Michael Keiser has decided at a last moment that he needs more BSNA wetlands and rare plant habitat for another golf course, while continuing to be unable to justify that his project would provide an ³overwhelming public benefit² per your standards.

I¹m very opposed to the long gooseneck addition proposed that would impact much more public land east and west of the gooseneck than the original proposal. Such impact is completely unjustifiable.

While I only lived in Bandon eight years, the Oregon Coast with its parks has been my family¹s favorite place to spend holidays and vacations since we moved to Oregon in 1970. I didn¹t remain an active member in conservation organizations where I once lived, but have continued memberships in Oregon Shores and Oregon Coast Alliance since moving back to the Rogue Valley because Oregon¹s coast and parks are some of the most important natural resources in the United States. For years OPRD statistics indicate that tourists are attracted to this state for its coast and parks, and about 65% of Oregon park day use is in coastal parks. Protecting the coastal park system is probably more important to the system as a whole than protection of any other state park.

While living in Bandon I helped start and served on the Bandon Watershed Committee when I learned about the small size of the city¹s watershed and that much of it is in private ownership. Bandon is one of many coastal communities in the US with too much population and use impact on its watershed.

A golf course takes a lot of water, and Michael Keiser has been purchasing cranberry bogs in the Bandon area, certainly in large part for the water rights. There¹s no more water available in the area; in fact like most of Oregon, water is over-appropriated. Another golf course would pump water needed for cranberry bogs and other agriculture around Bandon.

I encourage the Staff and Commission Board members to remain true to the recently adopted standards and deny this project.

Carol N. Doty
1040 W 13th Street
Medford, OR 97501

cc: Emailed to Governor Kitzhaber

OPRD Publiccomment - please approve the Bandon Land Exchange

From: "SmileDoc" <smiledoc@coolorthodontist.com>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 10/31/2013 2:09 PM
Subject: please approve the Bandon Land Exchange
CC: <tim.wood@state.or.us>, <vanessa.demoe@state.or.us>

To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Building another world class, low impact, environmentally sensitive golf course on the southern Oregon coast is an overwhelming public benefit in conjunction with the exchanges as proposed.

One measure of "public benefit" is how many members of the public use and enjoy any given piece of property, it seems clear to me that more members of the public will use and enjoy the 260 acres Mr. Keiser seeks to acquire when it becomes a (public) golf course than ever do now. More members of the public will use and enjoy the remaining 800 acres of the BSNA than do now because of the gorse control Mr. Keiser will contribute to the remaining parcel. And many more members of the public will use and enjoy the 6,000 acres in Grant County when they become public domain than do now. Maintaining the unspoiled nature of Whale Cove in Lane County will also benefit the public in the future when the proposed parcels are removed from the possibility of residential development.

I have visited the area south of Bandon several times with my children and dog. It is very remote, and will continue to be so after a low impact development is achieved. Easier access will be available for those that enjoy it now, and for those that will enjoy it, that never would have without this exchange.

Aside from those on dune buggies, the park land proposed to be swapped to Bandon Biota is inaccessible to most. The land Bandon Biota is offering in return will be much more accessible to many more members of the public. And since the plan is to create a walking course the public will benefit from increased opportunities for recreation and exercise.

I believe that there is an overwhelming public benefit to this exchange, and further a question to those in opposition, I ask what would be such a proposal if not this? Those in opposition, for the most part, would not see any proposal positively, and as such, are not credible in their opposition.

Thank you

Gray Grieve

Bandon, Oregon

w. 541.484.1877
h. 541.485.3515
c. 541.521.9393
f. 541.485.6544
smiledoc@coolorthodontist.com
Facebook @ Dr. W. Gray Grieve Orthodontics and Gray Grieve
InvisalignEugene.com

Eastern Oregon Professional Services, Inc.

P.O. Box 310, Mt. Vernon, Oregon 97865 ☞ 541-932-4366
Cell Phone: 541-620-0266 e-mail: suenews@ortelco.net

October 30, 2013

OPRD
Attn: Bandon Proposal (Grouse Mountain)
725 Summer St. NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Oregon State Parks and Recreation Commissioners:

I am writing in **suppor**t of the Bandon Proposal which includes the Grouse Mountain acquisition. I am a citizen, property owner, business owner and past Mayor of Mt. Vernon. I currently own a professional services company in Mt. Vernon along with an outdoor catering business (campfire cooking - dutch ovens – solar ovens, etc). In the next couple of years I plan on moving full time into this tourism based business as my "retirement" job.

The subject of OPRD acquiring the 6,300 acres on Grouse Mountain is very contentious here in Grant County. I firmly believe you are hearing opposition from the loud vocal minority. While I respect their right to voice their views, I do not believe it represents what the silent majority believes, based on my conversations with many of my fellow Mt. Vernon/Grant County residents. In reading the minutes and attending at least one public meeting at the Grant County Courthouse I don't see many opinions (or attendance) from the business owners who badly need tourism based business as part of their income. And I understand why; they dread confrontation and retribution from the vocal minority which is not an uncommon occurrence here in our small county.

Here in Mt. Vernon we have many businesses that desperately need tourism dollars inserted into their revenue stream; 2 gas stations; 2 mini marts; motel; RV park; restaurant; small bar and café; fruit winery; 2 quilting stores; auto shop, outdoor cooking catering company (me!); horse rentals and more. The addition of Grouse Mountain as a State Park represents a very significant **positive** economic impact to our small town. I could make a much longer list to include all of Grant County businesses that would benefit from this new proposed State Park.

As you know, Clyde Holliday State Park is Mt. Vernon's neighbor. Four of their employees live and are raising their families in our community. I cannot adequately express how much Clyde Holliday State Park means to the economy of Mt. Vernon and Grant County as a whole. Clyde Holliday State Park is a very important partner with the City of Mt. Vernon. They have graciously assisted the City in many related projects that improve both the State Park and our community.

The addition of Bates State Park in Grant County has been very positive. What is most surprising about the negative voices being raised in regards to Grouse Mountain are the very same loud voices who pushed the hardest for OPRD to acquire Bates. They didn't have the same concerns about adequate budgets to support Bates State Park that they are now voicing over Grouse Mountain, which is simply a mystery to me.

I can't help but comment about Rep. Cliff Bentz comments at the Aug. 19, 2013 meeting here in Mt. Vernon that I read in the minutes of that meeting. I find his negative comment very confusing. It wasn't so long ago I sat in a meeting with him at the Mt. Vernon City Hall in which he discussed the need for additional tourism resources in Mt. Vernon. He stressed we should capitalize on our closest natural resources, including the John Day River, and find a way to open them up to the public as an economic resource. And now it appears he spoke in the negative about the very same thing he suggested as a positive in the recent past. I believe the influence of

the vocal minority leaning on their local state representative was certainly in play at that meeting.
I am very saddened that it appears our County Commissioners do not seem to support this acquisition. However I also understand local politics and the pressure they are facing from the vocal minority. I wish the silent majority would make their position known to the Commissioners, but as I stated above many are very uncomfortable in expressing themselves.

Much has been said about the reduction of property taxes and the addition of more public land here in Grant County. In my opinion, the addition of this proposed State Park will produce **FAR** more income to this county than property taxes. The employment of new employees and their living and spending their pay checks here in Grant County will exceed any property taxes lost on this property. As for more public land…well this addition to State Parks will open up more access for recreation by local citizens and visitors alike. It will also provide public access to National Forest System Lands to the north that has been previously closed off by private ownership. State Parks has proven to us in Mt. Vernon what a good neighbor they are and I am confident they will continue to be a good neighbor with the new proposed State Park.

In regards to the weed control issues…a tour of some of the vocal minority's property who raised this concern will show you how poorly they are controlling weeds on their property. To raise this subject as an objection is an example of throwing something and seeing if it will stick to the wall; it is laughable. Based on the management at Clyde Holliday State Park and the lack of invasive weeds in that park makes me confident the management of invasive weeds at this new proposed State Park will be properly handled.

As for the subject offered by the vocal minority of not enough tourists in Grant County to support this new State Park, I would like to offer why I don't believe this observation. I have lived on Main Street (Hwy 26) in Mt. Vernon for 22 years and please let me assure you there is a lot of tourism traffic as supported by the presence of campers, recreational vehicles, motorcycles, bicycles, hunters, etc. traveling through our town. This is more than enough proof to me there are plenty of visitors who would love this new State Park. During the summer season Clyde Holliday State Park is regularly at capacity and having additional camping opportunities close to Mt. Vernon is much needed and in fact is identified in our strategic plan as an action item to create more camping facilities around Mt. Vernon to accommodate the overflow from Clyde Holliday State Park.

The vocal minority raised the issue of this property not having some kind of outstanding value necessary to making this a State Park. I would like to suggest this is not true. When the Meredith's acquired this property it was in very bad shape; overgrown, overgrazed, full of weeds, etc. They have worked very hard on projects that addressed forest health, riparian improvements, weed control, wildlife habitat improvements, meadow and wetland improvements and other important natural resource restoration projects. This property has outstanding value in regards to showing how sustainable management can restore poorly managed property and serves as a great example to the public of what good sustainable management can accomplish. This in itself is an outstanding value.

I am attaching an 8/7/13 Letter to the Editor that was published in our local newspaper for your review. It was written by Art Andrews who is employed by a local lumber mill and I think it is the most reasoned argument why this proposed State Park is a win/win/win for all parties.

In closing, I urge you to move forward and take the next steps to make this proposed new State Park a reality. Please rest assured this effort is supported by the silent majority of Mt. Vernon and Grant County.

Respectfully,

SUSAN E. NEWSTETTER, PLS
President - EOPS, Inc.

Oregon Cattlemen's Association

3415 Commercial St. SE, Ste. 217
Salem, Oregon 97302
Phone: (503) 361-8941 • Fax: (503) 361-8947
www.orcattle.com

October 29, 2013

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
725 Summer Street NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Chair Moriuchi and Commission Members,

RE: 2013 Bandon Biota Exchange Proposal Comments

The Oregon Cattlemen's Association (OCA) supports private property rights; however, in this instance OCA opposes the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department's (OPRD) acquisition of the Grouse Mountain ranch parcels outlined in the 2013 Bandon Biota Exchange Proposal. We are in support of the Grant County Stockgrower's position.

There remains unanswered questions and clearly significant local opposition to the purchase of this ranch. We would appreciate the following concerns and questions being adequately addressed and answered:

- A description of the proposed management plans for the Grouse Mountain Ranch parcels under OPRD's discretion;
- How the loss of tax revenue to the county will be reimbursed or otherwise compensated once the land is taken out of production and no longer incurring farm deferral taxes;
- The costs of managing additional public lands and the proposed generation of funds to do so;
- The details of an action plan for offsetting the unintended consequences from taking land out of agricultural production that neighboring landowners, the county and state will ultimately incur.

Oregon state agencies are continually suffering cuts to funding. Short staffed and underfunded, we are concerned that the 56% of Oregon lands now under public ownership will continue to see an increasing lack of management due to overextended resources. Government agencies acquiring private property in Oregon often results in taking working landscapes out of productivity. The unintended consequences of management decisions that negatively impact neighboring ranchers and landowners also adversely affect the broader community, by ultimately encouraging the conversion of private lands to urban development or other non-agriculture related uses. This fact has been recognized by NRCS; fortunately, this agency has indicated its commitment to its relationship with the agricultural producers that make greater wildlife habitat conservation possible.

The 2013 Bandon Biota Exchange Proposal states "The property will provide significant natural resources, recreational, cultural and scenic value to the park system." However, it is not clear how this proposal achieves the OPRD's acquisition evaluation criteria. We feel these listed benefits have the best opportunity to reach their fullest potential by continuing under private ownership. Grant County currently comprises of over 70% public lands which generate no tax revenue for their county. In addition to losing the Grouse Mountain Parcels farm deferral taxes that currently support local county services such as schools, hospital, emergency services, and library, there would be long-term rippling economic effects to the county and state from losing an operational ranch.

The Cattlemen's Association recommends the following considerations as an alternative to the Grouse Mountain Ranch parcels acquisition:

1. With the numerous economic challenges facing OPRD the funds could be better used for further support of programs or research geared towards the enhancement and ecological balance of vegetation and wildlife in their current parks.

2. OPRD's Mission is multi-faceted and they should concentrate on their present policy directives and programs not on additional programs and property to manage.

OPRD should not be acquiring the Grouse Mountain Parcels under their acquisition and exchange policy (OAR 736-019-0070) because the exchange will not "…provide an overwhelming public benefit to the… citizens of Oregon…" (as stated in the above listed policy). This is apparent from the OPRD's visitor records which indicate their coastal property visits per year by far exceed eastern Oregon park visits. In these times where vastly growing population paired with tremendous pressure on private working lands, such an acquisition promises tighter food supply, reduced economic benefit to the state, and increased financial responsibility of the public tax dole.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed acquisition of the Grouse Mountain Ranch parcels. The OCA strongly encourages the OPRD to fully consider the concerns of local communities.

Sincerely,

Curtis Martin, President
H - 541-898-2361
C – 541-962-9269
vprchnp@eoni.com

OPRD Publiccomment - Bandon State Natural Area Land Exchange Proposal - Comments

From: Doug Heiken <dh@oregonwild.org>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 10/29/2013 2:11 PM
Subject: Bandon State Natural Area Land Exchange Proposal - Comments

FROM: Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild | PO Box 11648, Eugene, OR 97440 | 541-344-0675 | dh@oregonwild.org
TO: Oregon Parks & Recreation Commission
VIA: OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us
ATTN: Bandon Proposal
DATE: 29 October 2013
RE: **Bandon State Natural Area Land Exchange Proposal - Comments**

Please accept the following comments from Oregon Wild regarding the proposed Bandon State Natural Area Exchange. Oregon Wild represents approximately 10,000 members and supporters who share our mission to protect and restore Oregon's wildlands, wildlife and waters as an enduring legacy.

Oregon Wild opposes the disposal of the Bandon State Natural Area parcel because the proponent has not made the case that the land exchange meets the test applicable to land exchanges proposed by parties other than OPRD that the exchange provides "overwhelming public benefit" that are "resounding, clear and obvious." While this standard is highly subjective, we feel that the public interest is best served by retaining public lands dedicated to recreation and natural amenities, and finding other resources to acquire new park lands. We do not wish to diminish the benefits of new and expanded park lands, but the cost of losing the Bandon State Natural Area is too high. We support acquisition of Whale Cove and Grouse Mountain Ranch when other resources become available.

In making it's decision, we urge the Parks & Recreation Commission to consider the following factors:

1. The Bandon State Natural Area (BSNA) was deeded to the state by the Dept of Interior in 1968 “for parks purposes only,” not for trading stock. If OPRD decides to trade this parcel so that a golf course can be built, the reversionary clause may be triggered, and BLM may require OPRD to purchase the deed at 100% of Fair Market Value. Including this significant cost in the equation will make it hard to find the exchange provides overwhelming public benefit. Much of the money intended for purchase of Whale Cove and Grouse Mountain will be used to pay this debt to the Department of Interior.
2. The Commission should carefully consider the effects of the golf development on imperiled species thought to be using the BSNA, including Threatened snowy plover and a two rare plants: silvery phacelia (with a state rank of "List 1" meaning that it is threatened with extinction throughout its entire range) and beach sagewort (with a Natural Heritage State Rank of S1 - "critically imperiled because of extreme rarity…”). These rare wildlife need more room to expand and recover their populations. The golf development, even if well-designed to accommodate sensitive species, will shrink the area of potentially occupied habitat.
3. The sensitivity of the natural assets of the BNSA have been recognized for a long time. That is why this area is designated as a "natural area" where recreation is encouraged in a natural, undisturbed setting with fairly minimal infrastructure, as opposed to a highly developed recreation site, golf course, or OHV playground.

4. The Bandon State Natural Area is very close to the Pacific Ocean. With climate change and rising sea levels, there is a significant value in retaining this parcel because public ownership provides more options for climate change preparation and adaptation that serves the public interest. In private hands, the future management of this parcel in the face of climate change will serve private interests, not public interests. For instance, the private owner might be tempted to install hardened shoreline protection which would result in adverse effects public resources. Shorelines are supposed to be dynamic. Trying to impose static engineered barriers will cause unintended offsite impacts such as increased erosion on adjoining parcels. The state with it current focus on natural processes and limited infrastructure is in a better position to tolerate and accommodate natural dynamic processes such as dune migration and sea level rise.
5. In evaluating the relative public benefit of parklands in different parts of the state, the Commission should consider the relative level of public interest (as measured by public recreation visitor days) in coastal areas compared to eastern Oregon rangelands. To be clear, we value conservation of rangelands, but it is clear that the public value of coastal areas is highly significant when the number of visitors is considered.
6. The proponent is seeking full fee title to the land. Their proposed golf development is not cast in stone, so the "overwhelming public benefit" test must consider all possible uses of the exchange parcel, including those that might conflict with the public interest.
7. The outline of the proposed exchange also says "Bandon Biota's contribution towards acquisition of the Whale Cove property [and others in the proposal] is non-refundable and <u>not contingent on completion of the rest of the exchange</u>." This makes it difficult to apply the public benefit test. The benefits of the exchange must be appropriately discounted to account for the uncertainty of realizing the public benefits.
8. Gorse control, while a laudable activity, is likely to provide only short-term benefits. Gorse will not be eradicated. It will likely return to the treated areas, and require continued state investment after the money from Bandon Biota is exhausted, so the public benefits of gorse control must be appropriately discounted.
9. Trading away the 280 acres of the Bandon State Natural Area is not even required to build a golf course. The proponent already controls enough land east of the BSNA to build a course.
10. Water use for a golf course could have adverse effects on surface water used by fish and wildlife and other water users. Groundwater removal so close to the ocean could also causes irreversible contamination of groundwater via saltwater intrusion.
11. Secondary development surrounding the proposed golf course could adversely affect existing property uses, including prime farm land.
12. In 2010-2011, a similar land exchange proposal was determined NOT to provide overwhelming public benefit and rejected by the state. This slightly modified proposal also fails to provide "overwhelming public benefits" that are "resounding, clear and obvious."
13. In the history of state parks we are unaware of any large land exchanges proposed by third parties being approved under the "overwhelming public benefit" test, as such we encourage the Commission to carefully consider the precedent-setting nature of using existing park lands as trading stock.

Sincerely,
/s/

_____

Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild
PO Box 11648, Eugene OR 97440
dh@oregonwild.org, 541.344.0675

From: Alex Linke <alex.linke@msn.com>
To: "OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us" <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 10/27/2013 9:39 PM
Subject: Proposes Land Exchange

OPRD,

I am writing to in support of the proposed land swap with Bandon Biota. The Bandon Dunes group has done a wonderful job in building world class golf courses and also preserving/enhancing our natural areas at the same time.

Our local economy has benefitted immensely as a result of the development of Bandon Dunes.

Oregon is lucky to have a great steward of the environment as Mike Keiser has been. He does things the right way with great business sense and equally important with a conservation mindset.

Overwhelming benefit without a doubt.

The proposed exchange has my full support.

Sincerely,

Alex Linke Jr.
Co-Owner
Table Rock Motel
840 Beach Loop Rd
Bandon, OR 97411

Sent from my iPhone

October 21, 2013

Governor John Kitzhaber
254 State Capitol
Salem, OR 97310

Dear Governor Kitzhaber,

A significant number of Grant County citizens and landowners have expressed opposition to the acquisition of the Grouse Mt. Ranch by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Dept. through a proposal included in the Bandon Biota Exchange. The Grant County Stockgrowers and the Oregon Farm Bureau are attaching our letters to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department as well as letters from the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, the Oregon Farm Bureau and the Grant County Court that speak clearly of the many reasons we are in opposition of this proposal. Further opposition has been expressed locally by many individuals and organizations:

- to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission,
- to our state senators & representatives,
- to the Grant County Court on numerous occasions;
- at the public meeting that was held in Mt. Vernon to accept comments (which included our Senator Bentz who spoke in opposition),
- in the local newspaper through letters to the editor,
- by neighboring landowners who have expressed their opposition to OPRD staff in person.

Despite the outcry, the OPRD continues to mine for support and has ignored the concerns and expressions in opposition. We understand that no final decision will be made by the State Parks and Recreation Commission until November 20th but we are asking you to investigate why this state agency continues to pursue this action against the wishes of the county and the majority of the taxpaying citizens that feel this would be detrimental to the well being of our county. We request you emphasize to this state agency that the objections to this proposal should not be ignored and to respect our concerns by denying the continual passage of private lands into government ownership.

Sincerely,

Jack Johns, president,
Grant County Stockgrowers

Jeff Thomas, president
Grant County Farm Bureau

Encl: 5

GRANT COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
301 West Main Street
John Day Oregon 97845
(541) 575-0547 (800) 769-5664 Fax (541) 575-1932
gcadmin@gcoregonlive.com www.gcoregonlive.com

October 7, 2013

Oregon State Parks & Recreation
Attention Jay Graves; Tim Wood; John Potter; Jim Morgan; Chris Havel

RE Proposed land sale of Grouse Mountain Ranch, Grant County, Oregon

Gentlemen,

Please be advised that Grant County Chamber of Commerce completely supports the proposed sale by George and Pricilla Meredith of Grouse Mountain Ranch to Oregon State Parks & Recreation.

OPRD does a tremendous job of effective, efficient and professional land management. Visitors come to Grant County to enjoy the abundant outdoor recreational opportunities. Grouse Mountain Ranch has tremendous potential; creating trails for biking, hiking, horseback riding and backpacking will attract additional visitors and create positive economic impact for generations.

Grant County Chamber of Commerce encourages OPRD to add Grouse Mountain Ranch to Oregon's asset list. Development and proper management of this valuable natural resource as an Oregon State Park will benefit Grant County residents, all Oregonians and out-of-area visitors. We are confident OPRD has the capabilities to manage this land for many years to come.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Mogg

Sharon Mogg, Executive Director

cc: George Meredith; file

delivered via e-mail

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS®
OF OREGON

October 9, 2013

To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission
Attn: Bandon Proposal
725 Summer Street, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301
Email: OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us

Re: Bandon Property Exchange Proposal – COMMENTS

The League of Women Voters of Oregon is a nonpartisan, grassroots political organization that encourages informed and active participation in government. The League adopted positions on Parks in January of 1999. Positions include a belief that state government should **"acquire, protect and preserve natural, scenic, cultural, historic, and wildlife sites….."; "protect public ownership of beaches"; "secure affordable and safe access to parks and ocean beaches.** The Oregon parks system requires a long-range strategic plan that, in part, should give high priority to **"Preservation and maintenance of existing parks; Protection and expansion of public access to ocean beaches; Acquisition of additional park resources".**

We remind the Commission of OAR 736-019-0070 which provides criteria for consideration of approving an exchange, including a most important part of the rule**: "To approve an exchange that a party other than the Department initiates, the Commission shall determine that the proposed exchange provides an overwhelming public benefit to the Oregon State Park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon."** (http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_700/oar_736/736_019.html)

In 2011, a proposal related to the Bandon State Natural Area was determined to not meet the criteria for providing overwhelming public benefit. This amended proposal should be considered similarly cautiously.

Members from around the state have followed the Bandon property exchange proposal. In particular, the League of Women Voters of Coos County provided the public with an opportunity to learn about the proposal, including from proponents and opponents. As a result, LWVOR provides the following specific comments that we hope will help guide the Commission in its decision making and that you ask yourselves if these factors have been adequately considered:

1. The land that is included in this transaction should be valued based on a recent assessment, and any money received in exchange for land should not be less than the value of the land.

2. A covenant should be put in place to assure the use of the property continues only for the purpose of a golf course, as proposed, and not for any other future development, such as a resort or lodging. Instead of a "sale," the property might be acquired through a long- term lease, with the land reverting back to park land, if land use conditions are not met.

3. If future geological actions cause the current beach adjacent to this property to subside or erode, and the property in the swap were to become the "new" ocean front beach, then the public must be provided free access to the "new" beach, as allowed under the Oregon law which protects public beaches. If the transfer goes through, it would also be an advantage to the public to have access to the beach through the property.

4. If the property were to become a golf course, no special waivers on local taxes should be allowed. (It has been reported that this area is not in an economic development zone and that a waiver of taxes would not be requested by Bandon Biota for this development.)

5. There should be some assurance that the water use for the proposed golf course does not have a negative impact on the current agricultural and residential uses in the area. An environmental assessment should be done, which would consider not only water use, but also impact from use of proposed chemicals, etc.

6. Questions have been raised about whether the adjacent parcel of land already owned by Bandon Dunes contains cranberry bogs, and whether their parcel and the park land are classified as *high value farmland*. If the land in question is zoned as *high value farmland*, then the question is whether a golf course would be a permitted use, or would qualify for a waiver under the County's land use plan. This discussion should be done in a transparent manner so that citizens have an opportunity to hear these issues and comment.

7. Finally, there is a concern that this transfer would set a precedent, allowing a private business to purchase public land for a profit making venture.

The League recognizes that there is an opportunity for a new park in Grant County and that the proposal might have some economic benefits. But we cite a recent Oregon Values survey (http://oregonvaluesproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/OVB_Summary_Top-Findings.pdf) where 57% of Oregonians value environmental protection. "They want an approach to economic development that recognizes the importance of the state's natural environment to its quality of life." With that in mind, and your own rule requiring for an overwhelming public benefit, we ask that you act cautiously and in the long term good of Oregonians yet to come.

Sincerely,

Robin Wisdom
President

Peggy Lynch
Natural Resources Coordinator

Susan Horn

PO Box 111

Mt. Vernon, OR 97865

October 2nd, 2013

Oregon State Parks and Recreation

I would like to submit a letter in support of George Meredith selling Grouse Mountain to Oregon State Parks and Recreation.

First and foremost, I believe George and his wife have every right to sell their property to anyone they wish. If the community as a whole has a problem with a potential land sale, they also have a right to make their voices heard. But our government, local, state or federal has absolutely no right to "dictate" who we as private citizens sell our private properties to.

The second point that I would like to make is that in my opinion "Oregon State Parks" makes a great neighbor! I have been involved with the City of Mt. Vernon for the past 18 years. First as a volunteer, than as a council member and currently as the Mayor. Throughout my involvement with the city, Oregon State Parks has stepped up to the plate many times to lend a hand. Our city had an annual city cleanup day for several years and State Parks was always a part of it. Several of their employees volunteered to help and they donated the use of equipment each year. The city of Mt. Vernon has continuously had inter-agency agreements with State Parks, both formal and informal. During times of emergency, they have always been right in the middle of our local emergency response. They have repeatedly loaned their P.A. system, tables and garbage cans to both the city and to community events. The class of people that Clyde Holiday State Park attracts has always been an asset to our community. Legal problems at the park are very rare and visitors often come to town to spend their vacation dollars at our local businesses.

I fully understand the concern of more property being taken off of our counties tax rolls. However, I believe the financial impact a park of this size would far out way any loss in taxes. Oregon State Parks currently employees at least 4 citizens from Mt. Vernon. These are people who were born and raised in Grant County. Family wage jobs with benefits are rare in our community and it is wonderful to know that 4 stable families have the choice to stay here and raise their families.

I would welcome Oregon State Parks and Recreation to our community. I am sure that any concerns that we may have could be solved and that the city of Mt. Vernon could greatly benefit from having them next door, again.

Sincerely,

Susan Horn

3415 Commercial Street SE, Suite 117 Salem, Oregon 97302 • 503-399-1701

October 3, 2013

Commissioners
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
725 Summer St. NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Oregon Parks and Recreation Commissioners:

Thank you for providing Oregon Farm Bureau an opportunity to testify at the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission meeting held in Condon on September 24, 2103. The Oregon Farm Bureau ("OFB") is a voluntary, grassroots, nonprofit organization representing Oregon's farmers and ranchers in the public and policymaking arenas. As Oregon's largest general farm organization, its primary goal is to promote educational improvement, economic opportunity, and social advancement for its members and the farming, ranching, and natural resources industry as a whole. Today, OFB represents over 8,000 member families professionally engaged in the industry and has a total membership of over 60,000 Oregon families across the State.

As expressed in our testimony, Oregon Farm Bureau ("OFB") has several outstanding concerns and various questions associated with the proposed Bandon Biota land exchange and related acquisitions. Answers to the following questions may help alleviate some of those concerns, and at the very least, facilitate a more productive conversation with our members as to whether the proposal qualifies as an "overwhelming public benefit" to the parks system, its visitors, and citizens of this State. For that reason, we request that the Commission direct OPRD to answer the questions below so that Oregon Farm Bureau and its members can provide meaningful and thorough public comments related to the proposed exchange.

- What water rights, if any, will OPRD receive as a result of the proposed exchange? If OPRD intends to acquire water rights by exchange or acquisition, what specifically will the water's beneficial use entail and what priority date will the water rights carry?

- How will OPRD utilize the Grouse Mountain property? For instance, will OPRD use the property for overnight camping, day-use, employee retreat center, or completely undeveloped? If OPRD intends to develop the Grouse Mountain property, how many buildings will OPRD build on the property and for what purpose will the buildings be used?

- In regards to the Grouse Mountain property, will OPRD lease farmable acreage or grazing rights to local farmers and ranchers? If so, has OPRD estimated animal unit months ("AUM"s) for the property and the price per AUM?

- Will OPRD allow hunting on any of the acquired properties?

- Will OPRD pay county governments and service districts an amount equal to lost revenue as a result of removing taxable lands from county inventory? If so, for how many years will the payments continue?

- Based on OPRD anticipated plans for each acquired property, how many people does OPRD estimate will use and travel to the acquired properties? Has OPRD conducted any traffic or environmental studies to determine the impacts of such plans that may affect surrounding landowners and government service entities?

- Again, based on OPRD's plans and estimated use, has OPRD developed budgets for each acquired property that fully reflect each property's anticipated management needs? For instance, has OPRD considered trail maintenance, restroom maintenance, road maintenance, vegetation control, and land management costs for each individual acquisition? If so, will OPRD make that information available for public comment prior to exchange/acquisition approval?

Thank you in advance for your answers to the questions above. Without more information regarding potential public impacts to the proposed exchange/acquisition, Oregon Farm Bureau's comments will remain fervently opposed. And furthermore, without more information to inform the public as to the benefits and costs of the exchange/acquisition, OPRD's calculus for making an "overwhelming public benefit" determination will prove to be an illusory standard.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Mike Freese at (503) 399-1701 or mike@oregonfb.org.

Sincerely,



Barry Bushue
President
Oregon Farm Bureau Federation

Cc: Chris Havel ***via email*** at: chris.havel@state.or.us

Date: September 24, 2013

To: Oregon State Parks and Recreation Commission

Subject: **Public input regarding the proposed OPRD Bandon/Grant Land Exchange and Park Creation**

The majority of Grant County residents have strongly opposed the proposed exchange and park creation in numerous County Court meetings and public input sessions. The principal concerns can be summarized as follows:

1. Grant County already has too much unproductive public land- 2 out of every 3 acres- and needs to increase private ground, not reduce it. This topic and a related ordinance have been discussed in County Court for many months prior to the OPRD plan being known because of other proposals by the Forest Service and ODFW. Increased private ground is needed to provide agricultural production and tax revenue to sustain the County's economy. County citizens have called for no net loss of tax revenue and replacement of any "swapped" private ground with newly acquired private ground to offset those losses.
2. The proposed OPRD exchange does not fit into OPRD criteria of "overwhelming benefits" for new parks as required by their own guidelines. There is nothing unique about the Grouse Mt property; access is difficult, potential visitor volume is minimal, and it is much too large to fit the role of a "park". Further, OPRD has demonstrated a continued inability to properly develop and manage their existing parks such as Kam Wah Chung, Bates and Owyhee parks. Commitments for improvements and historical presentations have been unfulfilled and the same failings could be expected with another park.
3. The economic loss to Grant County from the proposed swap could be in excess of $7.5 million, including tax and economic opportunity losses over the next generation. The park's contribution to the county would be negative since operating expense comes from the private sector and visitor revenue to local businesses would be negligible given its remote location and lack of proximity to county businesses. A transaction fee payment by OPRD to the County of at least $7.5 million would be required to offset these losses.

We know that our State Representative, Cliff Bentz, District 60, agrees with us on these issues because he attended the public meeting in Mt. Vernon and so indicated. We also understand that he will be writing a letter setting forth his objections to the proposed trade.

We ask the OPRD Commissioners to consider how you would feel if we announced we were coming into your homes and converting your property into our business using your money to pay for it. The arrogance of imposing your will on our county against the wishes of the citizens is a provocation that will not be ignored.

We respectfully request this proposal be dropped immediately and assure you we will use every legal, political and financial resource available to oppose the plan if it is pursued.

Sincerely,

Concerned Citizens of Grant County

Grant County Farm Bureau- Jeff Thomas, President

Grant County Sheriff- Glenn Palmer

Grant County Livestock Association-Jack Johns, President

Grant County Assessor/Tax Collector- Lane Burton

Grant County Commissioner-Boyd Britton

CC:

Oregon Representative Cliff Bentz, District 60

Oregon State Senator Ted Ferrioli

Oregon State Senator Jeff Kruse

Oregon State Representative Wayne Krieger, District 1

Oregon State Senator Betsy Johnson

Oregon State Senator Alan Bates

Oregon Governor John Kitzhaber

OPRD Publiccomment - Bandon State Natural Area Exchange Proposal

From: "Dan" <dmz29b@frontier.com>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 9/23/2013 9:50 PM
Subject: Bandon State Natural Area Exchange Proposal

To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission members

Re: Bandon State Natural Area Exchange Proposal

September 23, 2013

I greatly appreciate the transparency that OPRD has demonstrated in this process. The on-line posting of comments and OPRD documents has been invaluable. This depth and level of information could not have been available in public meetings only. Thank you!

Bandon Biota first approached OPRD about acquiring part of the Bandon National Area in 2010. At the Coos Bay meeting on July 17, 2013, Jim Morgan of OPRD said that it was rare to have an outsider approach the department about acquiring state park land. He said the department was not sure how to proceed and "agonized" over the process.

It was clear that any proposal would need to meet a high standard. Over 3 years, Bandon Biota sweetened the deal until some felt that the high standard had been met.

I disagree, as do many individuals who have commented on the website.

The preservation of places of wildness and great beauty for us to enjoy is a gift that has been given to us by preceding generations. Theodore Roosevelt talked about the people owning together the most magnificent places. Frederick Olmsted said that the rights of posterity are more important than the desires of the present. The beaches of Oregon are publicly owned because of the application of this type of thinking.

I think we should continue this grand tradition for both future generations and for the wildlife that inhabit these areas. Wild coastal areas in temperate climates are among the scarcest of natural resources and are among the most desirable for "development."

We are being told that there is nothing in the Bandon Natural Area but dunes covered with gorse. We are told that the best use of this resource is to turn it over " FREE OF RESTRICTIONS IN USE " to a private developer since public funds are not available for gorse removal.

We are told about all the monetary advantages of having yet another world renowned golf course that attracts individuals and celebrities from around the world (many of whom are arriving in private jets and paying huge amounts to play and stay at a destination resort.) We are told of all the economic benefits we receive from having Bandon Dunes in our community. We are told how "green" the resort

is.

We are not told of the 5 year enterprise zone tax exemption. We are not told that this world class resort has one of the lower tax rates in the county. We are not told of the numerous corporate tax benefits that are used for corporate golfers, nor of the tax payer subsidies to refurbish the airport for the increased number of private aircraft. We are not told how the resort maintains its manicured fields, nor are we told (except by one commentator Lynne Leisy, August 8 2013) how those playing fields were shaped.

In his presentation, Jim Morgan talked of consolidating parks with contiguous areas, increasing acreage and reducing high maintenance areas. This corporate numbers based management approach does not address non economic issues. This concerns me. It seems to be about looking good on paper.

What would future generations lose? In his comment on July 17, 2013 Reg Pullen spoke eloquently of how this area used to be:

"open meadows extended for miles from China Creek to Four Mile Creek. Lower Two Mile Creek was a beautiful stream lined with a lush grove of willows and provided great trout fishing"

He advocates giving the area to Bandon Biota because they have "demonstrated an ability to suppress and eradicate gorse on their property." I respectfully suggest that instead we ask them how they do it and get it done. Restore this area! Are we going to give away/sell all public properties with noxious weeds because we are not willing to assume the responsibility for these places? Wouldn't it be better to restore these areas and grow things? How about contests for gorse eradication and/or uses?

We are told that the best we can do is service/servant jobs at resorts. I think we can do better. Our economy would be better served with local agriculture and value added timber products. We are blessed to live in a beautiful area with mostly great weather. People come from all over the world to experience this beauty. Let's take care of it for both ourselves, our visitors and future generations.

Lydia Delgado
555 Douglas Ave.
Bandon OR 97411

OPRD Publiccomment - Bandon State Natural Area Exchange Proposal

From: "Dan" <dmz29b@frontier.com>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 9/24/2013 7:57 AM
Subject: Bandon State Natural Area Exchange Proposal

September 23, 2013

To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission Members

Re: Bandon State Natural Area Exchange With Bandon Biota

I attended the North Bend Commission meeting July 17th and the Bandon Open House meeting August 16th. I have read all the comments and the meeting notes plus the voting results from the open house meeting held at Bandon, Coos County and Mount Vernon Grant County. I want to thank the department staff for providing all the documents needed to make an informed decision.

After taking all this information into consideration, I would have to agree with many others who have provided input to the current commission. That this proposal DOES NOT meet a high standard of 'Overwhelming Public Benefit'.
Nor public Support..as shown by the meeting notes, comments, and voting results from Bandon and Mt. Vernon.

I believe the Oregon Coastal area is a crown jewel for the the State of Oregon. 362 miles of Ocean Shore. One of three states with an Open Beach Law. The Bandon State Natural Area is a gem in that crown. The name says it all. (Natural Area) Once it is sold, it is gone forever from the park system. Never to be natural again. The idea that OPRD cannot manage 280 acres of coastal land with gorse and should exchange it for 6,300 acres elsewhere that Dept. thinks it can manage does not make sense. This seems rather shortsighted to me. Your annual Performance Progress Report finalized (9/1/2013) states that Facilities Backlog repairs lags behind to about 79% complete---a backlog that has been on the books since 1999. These needed maintenance projects are on- going, and have to be addressed to maintain the #3 state ranking (2008-2009) as having one of the nation's best park system with total visits per state park acre. I would think that maintaining a high ranking and keeping what we have for our citizens / visitors would be of a higher priority for OPRD than obtaining larger tracts of land that will be harder to maintain and access. Grouse Mountain would only add to the overgrown Facilities Backlog.

A new park, Cottonwood Canyon is over 3,100 acres currently with plans to be over 8,000 acres. Silver Falls State Park is over 9,000 acres. The area of Grouse Mountain has 6,300 acres, OPRD already has 2 state parks nearby. Also in the same area are 23 combined US forest service and BLM parks-- all are in the vicinity of John Day, Grant County. Does OPRD want to get in the Fish and Game Business in Grant County ? Seems like a duplication of state agencies services. The figures I found on OPRD's web site are 3 years old. As of July, 2010, OPRD had a total of 102,457 acres, with over 361 parks with the average size park being 284 acres. Why does OPRD want such large tracts of land ? I would think that during lean times with tight state budgets that OPRD would be trying to keep up with the large backlog of repairs to the existing parks maintained by your Dept. Let's make the park system the best not the biggest.

We need more partnerships (with schools, civic groups, volunteer organizations...) to make our park system even better for the future. Perhaps the new Commissioners could invest in some time spent with local citizens obtaining more input. That means you give all the people you represent a chance to speak to you. Not just OPRD staff, business folks or politicians in your areas that you represent. I believe that is why the Governor appointed each of you. To represent all the citizens in the State Of Oregon. Partnership programs can work when money and favors are not an issue.

Again, after reviewing the information concerning this land exchange. I ask the commission to deny this request.
This proposal does not meet a High Standard of 'Overwhelming Public Benefit'. OAR 736-019-0070(4) to the Oregon State Park System, its visitors, and citizens.
I and many others believe it is a resounding NO to this land deal... CLEAR AND OBVIOUS.....

Thank You For Requesting comments.

Daniel D. Williams
88954 Beverly Lane
Bandon, Oregon
97411

September 21, 2013

Ralph J. Baxter
P. O. Box 316
Bandon, OR 97411

Mr. Tim Wood, Director
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Members, Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission
Attn: Mr. Chris Havel
725 Summer St. NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Re: Proposed Land Exchange with Bandon Biota

Dear Director Wood and Commissioners,

The only appraisal available now of the BSNA land under consideration as a part of this land swap has recently been defined as "outdated and obsolete". The comments below apply to that "outdated" appraisal. They are also relevant to any future appraisal done on State lands. I hope new appraisals will be posted soon.

It is my judgment that any use of this outdated appraisal is detrimental the best interests of the State.

The appraiser makes a statement similar to the following numerous times throughout the appraisal document:

". . . there is a hypothetical assumption given in the Scope of Work that the appraiser is to assume a highest and best use of a possible golf course."

And also states:

In addition, the verbal instructions are that the appraiser is not to consider any special benefits or damages to the remainder property of the State ownership."

The appraisal has been limited by these assumption to determine the value of the property to Bandon Biota, LLC., not to the State of Oregon. The restrictions (assumptions) placed on the appraiser by the state made an accurate determination of value impossible.

The BSNA land value was determined on the basis of comparable properties as an adjunct to a proposed golf course. Without this assumption there could be no comparable properties. The property is without parallel and without any comparable properties that could be used to determine value. A new 200-acre, beachfront, natural, un-molested area could not be purchased with the entire Oregon state treasury.

If you are a seller, as the OPRD is in this land swap, the actual value to the seller must be determined. Knowing the value to the buyer, not the value to the seller, is not a way for the seller to proceed with an exchange. The OPRD is being misled by this appraised value that conforms to the assigned Scope of Work.

The mandated assumptions required the appraiser to work within limits that made the results of his appraisal extraordinarily limited. He must only consider the value of the property to Bandon Biota, LLC. as an addition to their proposed golf course. Thus, this limited appraisal is useless to OPRD in establishing the actual value of the State property, Bandon State Natural Area.

The appraiser was required to determine the potential value of the land with the only allowable use specified as part of a fictional proposed golf course of indeterminate specifications. This would not allow the appraiser to find that the property had a highest and best use as an irreplaceable State Park Natural Area with over 300,000 visitors each year.

The appraiser describes the wonderful piece of property and is then limited to determining the value after it has been mauled and destroyed to create additional space for a fictional, nonspecific golf course.

There is no comparable property that can be used to determine value. This property cannot be replaced. The entire state of Oregon does not have an additional 200+ acres of natural, un-molested, unimproved property overlooking the ocean that could be used to replace this loss. This appraisal simply does not reflect the value of an irreplaceable State Park Natural Area.

The often-quoted description of the property as goarse-choked wasteland is very pejorative and inaccurate. Just viewing the photos attached to the appraisal invalidates this statement.

I urge OPRD to re-consider depriving 300,000 visitors per year, future generations of Oregonians and others, of the enjoyment of this natural area's uncommon beauty.

Ralph Baxter

Ralph J. Baxter
Bandon Oregon

September 15, 2013

Governor John Kitzhaber
Oregon State Capitol Building
900 Court St. NE, Suite 254
Salem 97301- 4047

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Christ Havel
725 Sumer St. NE
Salem, Oregon 97301
Email: chris.havel@state.or.us

RE: BANDON BIOTA EXCHANGE

Governor Kitzhaber, Chris Havel and OPRD Commission:

I am opposed to the land swap and cash exchange between OSPRD and Bandon Biota. You must protect the Bandon State Natural Area for the enjoyment and education of present and future generations because of the "outstanding natural significance" of this piece of land to our state park system. The Bandon State Natural Area is a unique, irreplaceable parcel of land. If you allow Bandon Biota to acquire this land, the State of Oregon will never own another piece of land like this. As my grandfather said, "They aren't making more land."

Another issue that has not received attention in the Bandon Biota exchange is the effect on adjacent and nearby cranberry bogs. The majority of the cranberry bogs in the area are zoned Exclusive Farm Use under the Coos County Zoning code. This poses a serious obstacle to a golf course. A new golf course adjacent to or in the middle of cranberry bog areas would cause many conflicts. These include: (a) availability and use of water by area farmers, as there is not much "new" water available, and farmers need to maintain current supply and water quality for food production; (b) ability to conduct common farming practices; (c) disruption to drainage systems and increased flooding; (d) impacts to the local agricultural industry, especially the critical mass needed to support agricultural infrastructure.

Anticipating building these next three golf courses, Bandon Biota has already purchased several cranberry bogs and is adjacent to quite a few other cranberry bogs. Oregon State law is very protective of high value soils (HVF) and the crops they grow, including cranberries. Any attempt to site a golf course in this area, even if the exchange is completed, would be subject to the "exceptions" process. In considering whether or not this exchange is of "overwhelming benefit" to the citizens of Oregon, you must also weigh the loss of these irreplaceable cranberry bogs in the balance.

Please continue to protect the residents of Oregon and do not approve this land and cash exchange.

Cindy Gant
PO Box1587
Bandon OR 97411
cindygant@msn.com

State law defines certain kinds of highly productive soils as "high-value farmland" (HVF). High value farmland means a tract of land composed predominantly of certain soil types. A "tract" means one or more contiguous lots or parcels under the same ownership. In the general area of the new Bandon Muni golf course, three HVF soil types are found, Bandon-Blacklock complex and Blacklock fine sandy loams. These soil types are designated as farmland of unique importance by US Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service, recognizing their capacity to grow cranberries. Most of the HVF soils in this area are east of the dunes, while the lands to the west, including BSNA, have no HVF soils. Under the "soil types" definition, the HVF definition can be "diluted" by adding more land, such as the BSNA chunk if exchanged. That would dilute the *percentage* of HVF in the tracts containing HVF, and make the area ineligible for protective HVF regulations under state law.

But cranberries are perennials, and cranberry bogs have water permits: Part of the definition in state law of HVF outside the Willamette Valley (ORS 195.300 (10) and 215.710) includes land growing specified perennials as of December 2007 according to Farm Services Agency photos. One of the "specified perennials" is cranberries. Any land in a contiguous block that includes cranberry production that has been there before 2007 would be considered HVF, regardless of soil type. It also wouldn't matter if more land (such as the BSNA parcel) were added to make a larger tract under a single ownership, such as for a golf course. *If the tract includes cranberry production anywhere in its boundaries, it would be considered HVF*. In addition, if the existing cranberry bogs were as of 2007 "in the place of use for a permit (or) certificate of decree for use of water for irrigation issued by the Water Resources Department," the tracts would be considered HVF, regardless of what percentage of the land in a tract is actually farmed for cranberries.

Why is this important? If any of the land in question is thus by definition HVF, a golf course is **not permitted** on lands zoned Exclusive Farm Use (ORS 215.283 (2) (f)). The only way a golf course could be allowed is if Bandon Dunes applied to Coos County for a "reasons exception." This land use proceeding would require that Bandon Dunes show why a golf course needs to be located on resource (i.e., cranberry bog) lands; what alternatives exist to placing the golf course on resource lands; the long-term impacts of changing the use; and what measures would reduce adverse impacts.

P. O. Box 1471
Port Orford, OR 97465
September 2, 2013

Oregon Parks & Recreation
725 Summer Street Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Attn: Bandon Proposal

To the OPRD Commission:

I do not play golf, though my husband enjoys the sport. I am a private citizen who is concerned about how we use our land in Oregon. I question whether the proposed swap by Bandon Dunes would really have "overwhelming public benefit." We went through this a few short years ago when a Curry County Commissioner had similar ideas. As you know, there was a huge public outcry from this area at the time, with many good reasons, in my opinion.

I would ask the Bandon Dunes people, "How much is enough?" The proposal for yet another course seems to me to border on greed. Together with Bandon Crossings, also a highly-rated course, Coos County seems to have enough places for those who so desire to play golf.

In hearings about the previous proposal, people pointed out statistics concerning what proportion of the public actually plays golf and how many courses are having difficulty in these tough economic times. Does the money really trickle down to help the communities where golf courses are located?

I urge you to use your best judgment on this issue and hope that you will deny this request.

Very truly yours,

Shirley Nelson

Shirley Nelson

September 4, 2013

To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission Members

Re: Bandon State Natural Area Exchange Proposal with Bandon Biota

I attended the Bandon meeting concerning this issue in August and want to thank the Parks Department for coming to Bandon to hold the meeting.

I do not believe this proposal meets the criteria of an 'overwhelming public benefit' to the parks system. I won't repeat many of the comments already made in other letters, but want to make two points.

1. From the beginning, this transaction has been referred to as a 'swap/exchange'. In its current iteration, there is not much swapping going on, it is simply an outright sale of public park lands to a private developer. In this deal, the plan is to keep the proceeds within the Oregon parks system to purchase other public properties. However, what, in the future, is to prevent the state from selling public park property to another developer, and using the money not for other public park purposes, but for other objectives the state feels is important, such as funding the shaky retirement system, better schools, roads, a bridge across the Columbia River? All these projects require money. State park properties could be viewed as an available source of funds. There are many developers who would be only too happy to pay a lot of money for some of Oregon's beautiful public lands. How will you say no to them after okaying this deal? Moving ahead with this would set a dangerous and unfortunate precedent.
2. What is so special about the Bandon State Natural Area that makes it so critical to Mr. Keiser's vision of another golf course? There are thousands of acres of undeveloped forest and farmland adjacent to and near this property where one could construct a perfectly decent golf course. Surely there are landowners in this area who would be receptive to a generous offer to sell to Mr. Keiser. Just look at Bandon Crossings Golf Course which is just across the road from the Bandon State Natural Area. This golf course was built just a few years ago without using any public property. If these folks did it, I am sure he can too. If this deal is rejected, there is nothing stopping him from acquiring private property to enable him to move ahead with his project.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Hellmann

761 12th St SW

Bandon, Oregon 97411

August 31, 2013

To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

To: Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission Members

RE: Bandon State Natural Area Exchange Proposal with Bandon Biota

I am opposed to the proposed land "swap" between Oregon Parks and Recreation Department and Bandon Biota. Not only does it not provide for overwhelming public benefit to the park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon, I do not see a public benefit at all.

Coastal Property is a limited commodity. It is scarce and cannot be replaced. Your website says "The mission of the Parks and Recreation Department is to provide and protect outstanding natural, scenic, cultural, historic and recreational sites for the enjoyment and education of present and future generations."

At the meeting you held in Bandon in July, you said one of the purposes of the OPRD is to protect land from development, however, you are considering turning over scarce property to an individual for development.

Not only would this be a bad thing for the park system, its visitors, and the people of Oregon, it would be a very dangerous precedent that you would be setting. The precedent of the Parks and Recreation Commission turning land over to an individual for development is absurd. I would actually call it selling parks land to a developer.

You said that you want to save Whale Cove from development but you want to put up land you already own for development in this land swap/sale.

I attended the meeting you held in Bandon where you heard public comments. Many people gave excellent reasons why this land swap should not happen.

One person mentioned that today the piece of land you want to give away is coastal property, but in the future it will be ocean front property. We heard it, but I am not sure how many people took this seriously.

Well, timing is everything and you need to read the article in the August 2013 issue of *Vanity Fair* magazine. The article is called "From Coast to Toast." It is an article about how the beaches and bluffs in both Malibu and Nantucket are disappearing into the ocean. There are pictures of the beaches as they were in the past and as they are now in 2013. Broad Beach in Malibu has lost over 60 feet of the beach in just the last ten years. Pictures comparing the

beach in 1972 and 2013 are shocking. Here is the link to that article: http://www.vanityfair.com/society/2013/08/end-of-malibu-nantucket-erosion

The land that you hold is valuable and rare and it should not leave the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department's holdings.

Another person at the meeting mentioned the huge amount of water that is drawn from the wells that the Bandon Dunes have. They said that drawing a lot of water from an area such as the land you are thinking of turning over to Bandon Biota could cause problems for the people who live out in that area and have wells.

I am having a problem finding any benefit to having another golf course vs. having this rare piece of nature in our parks system protected from development.

Several people mentioned the many forms of wildlife that live on this piece of property. What would be the benefit of destroying all this for another golf course?

The mention of jobs that might be created by a new golf course should not be a consideration for the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department when making this decision. These jobs would have no effect on the Parks and Recreation Department. The creation of 40 or 50 or even 80 jobs, mostly minimum wage, would not provide for overwhelming public benefit to the park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon.

I know things are very tough job wise in Oregon and I want every person who wants or needs a job to have one. However, the decision to be made here is to be based on whether or not this land "swap" provides for overwhelming public benefit to the park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon.

It was mentioned by Jim Morgan, in his presentation, that the land we have has gorse on it. It was also mentioned that the land we would get in the "swap" also has gorse on it and not to worry because gorse can be removed. It can be removed on the piece we already have just as it can be removed from the land we might receive in the "swap." Doesn't the OPRD have a gorse removal program for the land it owns?

So there is gorse and it can be removed. It is not a reason to get rid of a scarce commodity.

I keep putting the word "swap" in quotes for a reason. When the proposal was first introduced in 2010, it was a swap of lands being proposed. After evaluating the swap and deciding there was no overwhelming benefit to the park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon, the proposal was not recommended by OPRD.

Now there is a new proposal and it is still called a land “swap”. Realistically, we now have a land sale. The same properties that were found to not be beneficial are still the same properties that would be received. But now there is money involved. And once we have money involved, we now have a land sale. You want to sell a property that now belongs to the Park System to an individual for development for approximately 2.9 million dollars. And then with those 2.9 million dollars, you want to buy Whale Cove and you want to buy property in Grant County for a park that Grant County does not want.

And so I have stated my case. Please hold true to your mission statement and to your criteria of considering land acquisition and exchange only when it has provided for overwhelming public benefit to the park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon.

Since this seems to now be a sale and not an exchange, maybe it is not to be considered at all.

Sincerely,

Judy Smilan

761 12th St. SW

Bandon, Or 97411

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Nancy Evans <naevans1@frontier.com>
Date: Sat, Aug 17, 2013 at 12:44 PM
Subject: Re: Bandon meeting
I am in total favor of the plan but have not said anything formally.
If you would like to know I have 3 businesses in town, one a vacation rental for bird wachers here on the Jetty.

I think the folks out at the Resort are some of the best care takers of our environment around our area...maybe the very best! Plus they are currently granting funding from their new organzation called Wild Rivers to help family farms in Coos County. I was the manager of Bandon's Little Farmers Market for 13 years...we are very happy this Golf Resort money is going to help our farmers!

If this email can count as public input please include it.

Thank you again for your help,
Nancy Evans
1057 4th Street SW
Bandon, Oregon. 97411

541-8081069

From: Nancy Evans <naevans1@frontier.com>
Date: Sun, Aug 18, 2013 at 12:27 PM
Subject: Fwd: City of Bandon Special Council Meeting Agenda and Resolution - August 19, 2013

Hello, I am on the city manager's email list and on Friday morning this Public Notice of a Special Meeting of the City Council tomorrow at 4PM arrived in my Inbox(please see below). I still had my fingers crossed a Resolution of Support for the "land trade" was forth coming. Unfortunately the city of Bandon has NOT giving any Public Comment. In fact as far as I know the subject of the land trade and any resulting impact, one way or the other, has never been discussed formally here in town. Lots of "street talk" but NO discussion at the Planning Commission or City Council or any special district(fire, etc.). Why not? Your guess is as good as mine.

Of course the lands being considered/offered in the deal are outside the city limits but I was told guests of the proposed course will be using our town's accommodation, restaurants, etc. because the new courses will not include these services....giving Bandon great opportunities for managed growth. A God-Sent for a small town in the middle of nowhere you would think!

The Resolution the City IS interested in passing gives us a hint of what really is important to the Mayor and her Council.

The pests our city wants killed now are the food for the birds to come... Right? Will the federal government spray our pristine land and the certified organic and wild harvesting areas? Or will they.... Just Say No?

The folks we depend on to lead and guide our town are surrounded by the most beautiful natural resources of all types. I have traveled and this is a very special place. What is offered by Mr. K is a blessing! I wish he would just buy the town! So someone with an understanding of the balance we must maintain could take care of it the way it deserves. The funny part?
Bandon city hall would consider an offer. Really! ;-)

Anyway it is a perfect Sunday here on the Jetty overlooking Redmond Pond, everything in balance and harmony. I hope you have a wonderful day where you are too,

Nancy Evans
bandonbirdhouse.com (see on FilpKey.com)

ps is the note above(and attachment) worth putting with the other public comments? If you think so please be so kind as to submit with my thanks.

From: Carol Acklin <cacklin@mycomspan.com>
To: <chris.havel@state.or.us>
Date: 8/21/2013 2:22 PM
Subject: Bandon Biota

I attended the meeting on this land exchange when it was held in Bandon. I support the exchange. Even though it is public property and therefore a hot issue for some, I feel that the lands we will get in return (Whale Cove and that beautiful ranch in Grant County) for this hard-to-get-to piece of property far outweigh its loss to the Bandon area. Also, allowing Bandon Biota to create a municipal golf course allows for a far greater use of the property than exists today.

I understand there are a large number of visits to the said area, but I suspect many were repeat visits rather than unique visits. In addition, the land swap leaves a very large piece of the park untouched for use by those interested in the wildness of that area.

Your meeting was very well done. The two gentlemen who ran the meeting (Chris and Jim) were polite and level- headed, even when a few in the audience attempted to bully the proceedings. While I suppose that most of those attending were against the swap (only 4 of us spoke up in favor), I felt no "wave of anger" from most of them. They will no doubt grumble, but I doubt there will be more than that. Lots of people in Bandon either support the swap (and therefore felt no impetus to attend) or have no opinion on the matter.

Ultimately, the economic benefit from a new development will be good for the area and the jobs will be appreciated. I also look forward to visiting the two new beautiful parks that Oregon will develop.

Carol Acklin
Bandon

Chris Havel - Don't take our park

From: Larry Vonderlin <bandonites@hotmail.com>
To: "chris.havel@state.or.us" <chris.havel@state.or.us>, "OPRD.publiccomment...
Date: 8/6/2013 3:04 PM
Subject: Don't take our park

To: Chris Havel

There is only a small percentage of Americans who play golf according to the National Golf Foundation. The number is less than 8%. The percentage of Americans who have visited out national parks is 81%. This does not include county, city and state parks but shows that, in general, ten times as many Americans use parks than those who play golf.
The proposal to take part of the Bandon State Natural Area and turn it over to a private company for yet another golf course is absolutely wrong. If you allow this to happen you will be acting against the demonstrated wishes of the American people and giving in once again to a small, well-moneyed group. Taking valuable park land and turning it over to a rich developer in no way improves the park system.

Larry Vonderlin
56507 Prosper Jct Rd
Bandon, Or

Chris Havel - Bandon Biota Proposal to swap land for part of Bandon Natural Area

From: "William P. Russell" <billruss@mycomspan.com>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 8/18/2013 10:41 PM
Subject: Bandon Biota Proposal to swap land for part of Bandon Natural Area

The undersigned has been a resident of Bandon, Oregon for over 23 years. I was an active player in the fight to "Save Coquille Point." After which I was a City Councilor for 4 years. I was the founding President of Shoreline Education for Awareness and continued to lead SEA Inc. for 17 years. I have been President of CyberLynx for 14 years and am one of two volunteer teachers who offers free computer classes in Bandon. CyberLynx also serves as fiscal agent for BandonCares, a collaboration of the nonprofits that serve Bandon and of BandonPrepares, a nonprofit of which I was the founding President in December 2012. BandonPrepares supports the City of Bandon and the Bandon Rural Fire Protection District in developing disaster preparedness in the greater Bandon Area.

So I have a deep personal investment in this community. Once again I am deeply torn between my hope and my fear. In the early 90's, Mike Keiser's agents were proposing a change in zoning to permit the building of a golf resort that "will put Bandon on the map." They presented glossy brochures assuring us that this would be a different kind of golf course with minimal ecological impact. At the time I said "I am cautiously optimistic, we should give them a chance." By now my optimism has been amply rewarded. Bandon Biota is not only a land acquisition agent, but also a real player in the conservation movement in this area. Their work to restore salt marsh in the Coquille Estuary will augment the difference in Coho salmon recovery earned by the conversion of the Ni-les'tun Unit of the Bandon Marsh NWR.

This new proposal brings back both the pros and the cons but I am gently bending toward giving them another chance. But I'm not sure so I propose a counter offer: a 30 year revocable lease instead of a transfer of ownership. Include in the lease strict controls over the number and types of buildings to support the golf operation and an escape clause to terminate the lease early if conditions are not met with mandatory arbitration in case of difference of opinion over violations. Make the control of gorse a continuing condition of the lease not a one time expense; they are masters of gorse control and know that a single treatment is a waste of time and money unless followed up by continuing action. Take the beachfront property and the subsidy of the Whale Cove purchase but let the Grouse Mountain purchase wait for other funding. The Coast Trail rerouting at Sheep Ranch should be kept but the location and routing should be revealed to the public.

Chris Havel - Proposed Bandon Biota/BSNA Exchange

From: "David R. Allen" <daveallen@estplanlaw.com>
To: <chris.havel@state.or.us>
Date: 8/21/2013 4:57 PM
Subject: Proposed Bandon Biota/BSNA Exchange

I have been a Bandon resident for over 13 years and am recently retired. I support the proposed exchange for the following reasons.

1. Mr. Keiser has been an enlightened golf course owner, having recently won a national award for environmentally sensitive course maintenance.
2. The town of Bandon will benefit from the construction of a new course of this caliber south of town – it will cause Bandon Dunes Resort guests who otherwise might not leave the resort to travel right through downtown Bandon to try the new course.
3. If one measure of "public benefit" is how many members of the public use and enjoy any given piece of property, it seems clear to me that more members of the public will use and enjoy the 260 acres Mr. Keiser seeks to acquire when it becomes a (public) golf course than ever do now. More members of the public will use and enjoy the remaining 800 acres of the BSNA than do now because of the gorse control Mr. Keiser will contribute to the remaining parcel. And many more members of the public will use and enjoy the 6,000 acres in Grant County when they become public domain than do now. Maintaining the unspoiled nature of Whale Cove in Lane County will also benefit the public in the future when the proposed parcels are removed from the possibility of residential development.

Thank you for your consideration.

David R. Allen

Chris Havel - Fwd: Bandon Biota proposed land swap

From : "blaine s. rose" <broseandorjhull@gmail.com>
To: <chris.havel@state.or.us>
Date: 8/28/2013 1:55 PM
Subject: Fwd: Bandon Biota proposed land swap

Regarding the proposed Bandon Biota land swap:
As I understand the measuring stick is "overwhelming benefit to the public". It this is true then increased jobs and getting rid of gorse on both the swapped land and also on other State land should be included in this measure. If the State was in a position and had to wherewithal to eliminate the gorse on the land involved in the proposed swap presumably they would have already done it. That has not happened. But Bandon Dunes has the proven ability and financial resources to do it. So to me part of the choice is gorse or mitigation. The latter won't happen without the swap. The public would be foolish to fail to take advantage of this opportunity.
And as a Coast Watcher reporting on miles 93, 94 and 95, I have reported for about a year now that gorse has started to appear on the West side of the New River, where it is joining that other invasive specie, European beach grass. The less gorse there is on the East side of the New River, the less seeding will occur on the West side. The snowy plover are already pressured by botanic changes along the dunes and the gorse is not going to make the situation better for those little birds.
I own ten acres at 86544 Lower Fourmile Lane (very close to the proposed swap) and have been fighting gorse (with not inconsiderable help from the Bureau of Land Management) on our land for years with some success. But I am surrounded by absentee owners with gorse covering their properties (and constantly reseeding mine).
Any thought that the current park property is available for public enjoyment is fatuous. Have your ever tried to walk thru thick gorse? Can't be done unless you are a rabbit or a path has been cut. (Which Bandon Biota has kindly done on the land they acquired from the county at the end of Lower Fourmile Lane for the benefit of the public.)
We have already had at least one fire start over in that area two or three years ago. An area that is very rarely visited so there is very little monitoring. The history of Bandon and fires started in or propagated by gorse is well known. If the land swap goes forward and the proposed golf course is built the chances of another fire, possibly expensive and/or fatal will be considerably reduced. This, too, should be weighed in considering public benefit. If there is a fire which leads to property damage or fatalities Oregon Parks might be liable.
I am not a golfer but I have enjoyed the opportunity to walk and tour the various Bandon Dunes courses. I was struck by the presence of deer who were not at all perturbed by the my presence. Unlike the deer at our own property. And the deer around our place have been declining noticeably according to both my observations and those of our neighbors over the last six years. The local mammals include beaver, raccoon, porcupine, skunk, fox, deer, rabbits, and numerous rodents including field mice and voles. I am no biologist but I suspect the only group that would suffer if that land became a golf course would be the rabbits as they can travel within the gorse and so would lose shelter. But, even for them, there will be grass. And the local deer population, now severely stressed, may increase and find habitat.
It should be noted that the Keiser Foundation has been immensely supportive of many community activities in the Bandon area thru their charitable activities and donations and presumably these will continue and be enhanced as Bandon Biota's economic activities expand. This, too, should be included when evaluating "overwhelming benefit to the public".
Property tax revenues to the school district, the hospital district and others will be enhanced if this proposed swap goes thru.
Bandon Biota happens to own a large expanse of land immediately across the Lower Fourmile Creek

and South of my property. They have been a wonderful neighbor, immediately responding when wind damaged one of their buildings and sent a crew out to mitigate the problem before any debris could fly off and damage any neighbors' structures. (The winds down here have been measured as high as 126 miles per hour.) They have also actively been replanting their land to protect the Creek for indigenous fish. They are proven good stewards of their lands.

Finally, the park land proposed to be swapped to Bandon Biota is inaccessible to most. The land Bandon Biota is offering in return will be much more accessible to many more members of the public. Another benefit, in my view, to be considered when calculating whether this proposal provides "overwhelming public benefit". And since the plan is to create a walking course the public will benefit from increased opportunities for recreation and exercise.

Yours,

- John Hull
86544 Lower Fourmile Lane
Bandon, OR 97411
775 997-5647

Craig J. Herman
13180 S. Carus Road
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-347-0699

August 20, 2013

Commissioners
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
725 Summer St. NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Re: Proposed Land Exchange with Bandon Biota

Dear Oregon Parks and Recreation Commissioners:

I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed land exchange between Oregon Parks and Recreation Department and Bandon Biota (aka Bandon Dunes Golf Course). I request that the Commission not support the land exchange in its current form. The scope of this land exchange does not contain sufficient benefit to the people of the State of Oregon to justify it.

I am particularly concerned that the Grouse Mountain Ranch Parcel was included in this exchange proposal. This would remove a significant amount of land (6,100 acres) from private ownership in Grant County. A substantial portion of Grant County (approximately 70%) is already in public lands. By removing additional lands from private ownership, the property tax base for Grant County would be significantly reduced. In my opinion, the highest and best use for this parcel should continue to include farming, ranching and timber production. The proposal by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission does not identify any unique features of the Grouse Mountain Ranch Parcel that would justify its acquisition or why this needs to be turned into a park. There are already adequate lands in the various park systems in the State of Oregon. In assessing adequacy, the Commission needs to recognize the vast amount of Oregon land that is already held by various Federal, State and Local governments and available for public use. Providing this Department with additional lands does not make sense. Where will this agency get additional funding to manage additional lands?

Transferring this land to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department clearly does not contain a true public benefit. I ask that the commission oppose the proposed land exchange.

Respectfully yours,

Craig J. Herman

Cc: Oregon Cattleman's Association
Senator Ferrioli

OPRD Publiccomment - Bandon Natural Area

From: Kellie and Francis Lombardi <fplom@earthlink.net>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 8/14/2013 8:38 PM
Subject: Bandon Natural Area

public comment regarding the plan to trade off Bandon State Park

Dear State Park Commissioners,

This proposal cuts to the heart and soul of oregon state parks, not just Bandon or Coos County. Diversity should be the hallmark of our parks system. We need to save the full spectrum of natural habitats and recreation opportunities that define our great state. We count on you to be stewards of the land and tell the Governor and parks people that we want them to act with courage and integrity in the face of extreme wealth and another trumped up argument about jobs vs the environment.

Diversity is not just vital to the natural world, it's also important to the economic and social sustainability of every community. Bandon is fast becoming a golf mecca, rather than a community of year-round Oregonians. We don't need one more golf course, especially at the expense of a fragile and dynamic dune environment that is home to at least one plant in danger of going extinct - i.e. gone forever. The land also is a vital buffer for the endangered shore birds that nest on the beach.

Some say Mr. Keizer is doing the community a huge favor by providing a low cost golf course for locals and job opportunities for our youth….but according to Golf Travel Insider, he already has bought enough land to do this. He wants this additional public land so that he can have a 27-hole course instead of just 18! This is public land - it's our land. It would be obscene for the parks department to trade away rare habitat in order to provide more land for a golf course that could be built without that land. And what will become of this land in 25 years? Hard to believe but golf might actually become passé some day. What then? There are no protections or guarantees that go along with the land. This trade would remove the federal protection that currently exists. This land could become condos or a private recreational development that is not "municipal" and not open to the public. It could become something even worse - there are no strings attached to what a private landowner could do with it in the future.

I went to the trailhead and walked through some of the state park land. It's awesome! It's superlative just as it is and it's important to protect. I agree with the people who say we won't wish we had more golf courses in the future, but we will wish we had more wildlife and open space and hard to get to places that remind us of how small we are in the grand scheme. A place to contemplate a REAL, live birdie. I believe you could find studies that show just how much money bird watchers and other tourists bring to a community. Infinitely more than a single industry.

Bandon has drawn visitors from all over the world before you and I were born, long before the first golf course was developed here. We are on the cusp of letting what makes this area unique slip away. Our parks system is traveling down a slippery slope. If they can trade out of a natural

area that provides habitat for an imperiled plant species, then it becomes easier to trade out of a less unique place, like maybe parts of Bullard's Beach or Devils Kitchen. Why not sell off the Face Rock access point - wouldn't that make someone a nice homesite? The public can just go a little ways north and get to the beach at Coquille Point. You get the idea. Truly unique park land should not be for sale - at any price.

Please join with others who care about a sustainable future for Bandon. Celebrate an 18 hole municipal course with jobs and youth scholarships for local caddies NEXT to a unique state natural area, rather than instead of a natural area. The land they want to trade away provides locals and visitors with access to New River and awesome dunes. I have nothing against Mr. Keizer, but I'm not willing to quietly stand by while the state hands him unique property that should be held for the greater good and future generations. Please say no to this "deal".

Julia Smith
PO Box 1765
Bandon, OR 97411

OPRD Publiccomment - No on Bandon Dunes Trade

From: Bruce Barbarasch <treeturtle@gmail.com>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 8/11/2013 8:05 PM
Subject: No on Bandon Dunes Trade

Dear Park Commissioners,

I read the proposal to swap land from coast for ranch land inland. I highly support the acquisition of new land both along the coast as well as inland, however I am against selling any land on the coast.

We all know they don't make land anymore. Given that coastal access is in high demand and will continue to do so as the population grows and tourism increases, I can think of no excuse for selling of land near the sea.

Let's find another way to get the ranch, but please keep the coastal land at Bandon.

Sincerely,
Bruce Barbarasch
3510 SE Alder St.
Portland, OR 97214

OPRD Publiccomment - Bandon Biota Land Swap

From: "Myra & Jim Lawson" <myrajim2@mycomspan.com>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 8/8/2013 5:45 PM
Subject: Bandon Biota Land Swap

I am concerned with the proposal for three reasons: 1. Precedent setting 2.economic impact 3. land use planning

Doesn't giving up public park lands for private use set a **precedent** for Oregon? Oregonians care very much about their natural resources.
Bandon Biota (i.e.. Michael Keiser, Bandon Dunes) would then own the 280 acres privately. Could they sell or develop something other than a golf course? Would another owner be able to buy and/or develop it in the future?
Economically, Bandon Dunes has brought jobs to our area. Many of them are "migrant" jobs where caddies commute from Oregon to Arizona or California for the winter months. Many others are restaurant and lodging tourist jobs. Most office and management jobs have been filled by experienced people imported from other areas. There are restaurants and lodgings available at the Resort, so very few golfers use the motels, vacation rentals, and restaurants available in Bandon. The Bandon City Planner recently stated publically that 50-55% of the Vacation Rental Dwellings are filled during the four summer months, the motel vacancies are similar. I never need to make reservations for one of our 25 eating establishments.
We certainly appreciate the donations to our 501C-3 organizations made by Mr. Keiser and his foundation, however he must appreciate the extremely low property tax rate which his Enterprise Zone County taxes have given him. The Resort still benefits from Coos Co. roads, water, utilities, fire, police, and ambulance services as well as our hospitals and schools. Bandon Dunes certainly benefits from our airport. From what used to be a reasonable fare with free parking, fares and rates have risen so that now most travelers at the Coos Co Airport carry golf bags. Few full time residents can afford to use what is part of our tax liability.
If the swap is agreed to, then I recommend that **Land Conservation and Development** study the adjacent properties, considering possible development and water availability. Another Vacation Resort Zone should be out of the question, and no buildings should be allowed on the 280 acres as Bandon Dunes owns many other acres in the area. There should be leaseback, conservancy or other legal clauses making sure that the proposed public land to be transformed into private holdings be a golf course, environmentally managed in perpetuity.
Myra G. Lawson
1404 Strawberry
Bandon, OR 97411
541-347-5157

August 8, 2013

Tim Wood, Director
Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission, Members
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
725 Summer St. NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Re: Bandon Proposal

Director Wood and Commission Members:

My name is Lynne Leisy and I am submitting these comments in opposition to the proposed land swap between the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) and Bandon Biota.

The proposed land swap as initially presented to OPRD by Bandon Biota in September 2010 and July 2011 was rejected since it failed to satisfy and meet the criteria for "providing **overwhelming** public benefit to the park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon." (OPRD's OAR 736-019-0070) This was a correct and reasoned determination due to the high and unique environmental value of the fore dunes desired in the land swap. In a Eugene *Register-Guard* article of April 9, 2013, OPRD's natural resource specialist, Sherri Laier, talks about the abundance of plant and animal life, the biota, if you please, of Bandon State Natural Area (BSNA). Ms. Laier speaks to the value of the BSNA as "a magnificent example of the dunal systems. As you know, the coast has been developed from California to Washington, and to find an undeveloped piece of dunes is very, very rare. This State natural area description is the highest designation we can give a state park. It means we don't put any facilities on it, we don't even put in trails, necessarily. We leave it natural." Ms. Laier is also quoted as saying a golf course "would be devastating to the natural area…this is where all the value is of the dunal system." The same article also states the acreage in the area was obtained by the OPRD from the federal Bureau of Land Management, "with the caveat that it remain in its natural state, meaning that the BLM would have to agree to any deal to build a golf course." Has this issue of development been approved by the BLM? Or is Bandon Biota going to use its wealth and political clout on the BLM to ensure the bulldozing of 280 acres of dunes to create Bandon Muni?

The earlier rejected land swap proposal was for 210 acres of Bandon State Natural Area dunes to develop a 27 hole-golf course and the promise of 40-50 employees at the new Bandon Muni in exchange for properties owned by Bandon Biota/Bandon Dunes Resort/Michael Keiser: a 97-acre Bullards Beach Spit parcel adjacent to Bullards Beach State Park and 111 acres adjacent to the southwest line of Bandon State Natural Area. After the initial rejection by OPRD, the proposal was sweetened with the addition of $3,250,000 to purchase properties in Lincoln and Grant County and to aid in gorse mitigation. There was also an increase to 80 Bandon Muni employees. The acreage carved out of Bandon State Natural Area was also increased, to 280 acres, 31.8% of the total 878 acres. It has not been proven to me how this loss of 280 acres of a unique dunal system is a public benefit to the park system and to the citizens of Oregon.

According to the OPRD's website, the Bandon State Natural Area has numerous activities – hiking, picnicking, viewpoints, wildlife viewing, fishing – with beach access and restroom facilities available for the annual day use attendance of 306,412 visitors! I understand how Bandon Biota benefits – the corporation acquires more land to build another golf course. Please refer to the "Proposed Exchange with Bandon Biota" submittal by the Oregon Coast Alliance, signed by Cameron La Follette, and dated July 12, 2013, including the attachments to Oregon Coast Alliance's testimony. Besides the BLM issue, the testimony also questions the need of Bandon Biota for the acreage to construct Bandon Muni. Oregon Coast Alliance cites an article from a May 13, 2013 *Golf Travel Insider* where Michael Keiser, founder of Bandon Biota, admits he already has enough acreage to build a "pretty good" course, but with the additional acreage "it would be superlative." It appears Bandon Biota is not overly concerned with the public benefit; what Bandon Biota's Mr. Keiser is concerned about is golf and the golfing experience, at whatever the cost. When it comes to satisfying golfers, and encouraging their return, the Bandon Dunes Resort will do what it must, even modifying the landscape. In the Eugene *Register-Guard*'s April 9, 2013 article "Resort Doesn't Let Its Courses Rest on Their Laurels", the Bandon Trails' 18th hole was modified because initially, it was a "blind tee shot over a dune, and a tough approach shot to a false-fronted green, all this playing into the wind in the summer." There isn't much anyone can do about the summer winds; but "in the redesign, the dunes was lowered so golfers can see the green from the tee box. The green was lowered as well, to remove the false front…and a severe slope on the right side of the green was softened with the lowering of the green. All this to reduce the chances of a good round being undone by a quadruple bogey with the clubhouse in sight." So much for the statement by one of the proponents of the land swap that "Bandon Dunes has had a light touch on the environment …and they follow the contours of the land." (www.theworldlink.com article by Amy Moss Strong, July 22, 2013)

On a more personal level, I witnessed some of the construction of the south entry to the Bandon Dunes Resort at the intersection of Fahy Road and U.S. Highway 101, north of Bullards Beach Park, in early 1998. Before this entry was completed, an existing dune abutted the west edge of Fahy Road, dipped down to and continued east of U.S. Highway 101. This dune was bulldozed and graded to provide an entry suitable to the vision of the Resort's planners. **Attachment A** provides photographs of some of the changes and equipment used to reconfigure the dune. Unfortunately, I failed to photograph the dune before a portion of it was contoured out of existence, including whatever biota it supported. Again, no "light touch" displayed.

Proponents say the acquisition of the 280 acres of Bandon State Natural Area by Bandon Biota will be to the public's benefit, since Bandon Dunes Resort has been a good corporate citizen, providing employment and charitable contributions to the local citizens and a boost to the local economy. And yet Coos County's poverty level and unemployment numbers are still high, with many students receiving reduced or free lunches. Hopefully, the 80 promised jobs at Bandon Muni will alleviate the impoverishment of 80 families. One group, at least, will benefit - the golfers and future golfers of Coos and Curry County! Bandon Muni will magnanimously offer rounds of golf to Coos and Curry County residents, not at the High Season rate of $280, but at

the discounted rate of $25. Hopefully, the Resort's reservation staff will give preference to locals when scheduling tee times at Bandon Muni.

The offer of cash to aid in gorse removal is not an overwhelming benefit since OPRD already has a gorse mitigation program in place, which is doing its job. Please pardon my cynicism; if the Bandon Biota land swap proposal is already a "done deal" in the minds of the OPR Commission, I have a suggestion to get the most out of Bandon Biota's Bandon Muni. Add the stipulation that a portion of the fees collected from the courses be donated to OPRD for continued gorse mitigation! A precedent for this charitable conservation donation has already been set by Bandon Biota. All net proceeds from the Bandon Preserve Golf Course at the Bandon Dunes Resort benefits the Wild River Coast Alliance, an organization which coincidentally supports the current land swap between Bandon Biota and the OPRD.

As for the acquisition of Whale Cove property in Lincoln County – apparently this acquisition is already in process. Bandon Biota's cash offer would only speed up the purchase of the property. It is disingenuous to say, that by protecting scenic values and critical habitat for coastal wildlife in the 10.87 acres at Whale Cove, this is in the column of public benefit to the park system. Is there no public benefit in the scenic value or critical coastal wildlife habitat in the 280 acres at Bandon State Natural Area? 306,412 annual day use visitors seem to think so!

In regards to Grouse Mountain Ranch in Grant County – the testimony and submittals from the concerned citizens, both private and public, of Grant County indicate they are opposed to the purchase of Grouse Mountain Ranch and can see no public benefit to themselves. Or will the OPRD and OPR Commission see this as a "greater good" issue and give little weight to the objections of the people of Grant County in making its decisions?

In general, I'm disappointed in the OPRD's land acquisition and exchange policy's process of "determining overwhelming public benefit to the park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon." The burden of proof should rest with the proposer of the land swap. Jim Morgan's presentation to the OPR Commission on July 17, 2013 is more a listing of the components of the land swap, and I feel, lacks a clear determination of the benefits, if any, from the land swap. Bandon Biota benefits, but not Bandon State Natural Area. And Bandon State Natural Area should benefit. Instead, it is losing 280 acres of a dunal system of unique biota and habitat. How can anyone quantify this loss?

I appreciate how difficult a decision-making task the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department staff and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission has in determining whether this Bandon Biota Land Exchange Proposal is truly in the interest of the citizens of Oregon. Thank you for your consideration and efforts.

Sincerely,
Lynne Leisy
88643 Weiss Estate Lane
Bandon, Oregon 97411

FAHY ROAD & U.S. HWY 101
INTERSECTION

March 16, 1998

March 18, 1998

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Park is win-win

To the Editor:

After reading the articles and comments regarding the proposed conversion of George and Priscilla Meredith's Grouse Mountain Ranch to an Oregon State Parks Department property, I am reminded of "Seward's Folly."

The public and political outcry against the purchase of Alaska from Russia showed that this was also controversial at the time. However, the purchase turned out to be of great benefit to the United States. I feel that the Grouse Mountain proposal will have a similar result for Grant County.

While I understand the concern regarding private lands transferring to government property, I feel that this particular situation does not call for alarm.

When the Merediths purchased the property it was largely unimproved. They hired many local companies to make improvements. Restoration through active constructive management of the property has been their focus. Projects and investments have addressed forest health, riparian upgrades, weed control, wildlife habitat improvement, meadowland productivity as well as constructing and improving infrastructure.

The Merediths pay approximately $18,000 a year in county taxes. Two-thirds of this relates directly to the investments they made in their residence. Only one-third relates to the land.

A large state park (over 6,000 acres), will attract visitors to the area which will bring in badly needed revenue. Also, the state park will add direct employment by the Parks Department and investments in park development. The Oregon State Parks Department has an excellent track record of effectively managing their properties.

The Merediths have an opportunity to realize their long-term vision of a wonderful natural resource area that will be managed for the benefit of wildlife, native ecosystems and people who love and respect nature. The park service will establish a fine example of a natural area they can manage for the interests of people and wildlife, and Grant County will gain an asset that will attract visitors and their related economic activity and provide a valuable recreational resource for residents for the long-term. This is a win/win/win opportunity.

Art Andrews
John Day

Not an attack

To the Editor:

Leland Spencer's letter to the editor July 31 is the nastiest one I have ever read in the Eagle.

Your letters policy reads in part, "no personal attacks." So, if his letter was acceptable, I guess this one should be, too.

Anna Pearson Alegria
(Former Grant County resident)
Bend

Letters policy: Letters to the Editor is a forum for Blue Mountain Eagle readers to express themselves on local, state, national or world issues. Brevity is good, but longer letters will be asked to be contained to 350 words. No personal attacks; challenge the opinion, not the person. No thank-you letters. Submissions to this page become property of the Eagle. The Eagle reserves the right to edit letters for length and for content. Letters must be original and signed by the writer. Anonymous letters will not be printed. Writers should include a telephone number so they can be reached for questions. Deadline is 5 p.m. Friday. Send letters to editor@bmeagle.com, or Blue Mountain Eagle, 195 N. Canyon Blvd., John Day, OR 97845; or fax to 541-575-1244.

8/07/2013

Serving Eastern Oregon since 1894

KILPATRICKS

Mike Kilpatrick, P.C.

P.O. Box A
195 W. Main Street
Mt. Vernon, OR 97865

Telephone: (541) 932-4455
Facsimile: (541) 932-4457

August 5, 2013

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
725 Summer St. N.E. Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Re Bandon / Grant County proposal

I own the land West and North of the Meredith property. My ranch borders this property for about five miles.

I oppose this deal.

The state is usually a horrible neighbor.
I will have trespass problems. The State can't manage and finance the park system it has. This large parcel will require management.
It seems the park can't manage weed control on 300 acres, how will it manage 6,000 acres.
I have had no contact of any kind from the state about this deal. That does not bode well for the future. Why no contact with the neighboring property owners?
There are water rights issues on Fall Creek that are still not transferred by the State of Oregon.

I have either leased or owned or worked on this property from 1958 until the Meredith's bought it, I think I understand it well. This land does not qualify under Oregon law to be a new Oregon park. There is nothing unique or outstanding.

The State bureaucrats don't need a 2 million dollar log mansion for an executive weekend getaway.

I also worry the State is empire building. Clyde Holliday gave the state the land for a park the state then condemned MORE of his land to expand the park. I don't want that to happen to my ranch.

Mike Kilpatrick
cc George Meredith
Commissioners

July 24, 2013

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Attn: Bandon Proposal
725 Summer Street, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Re: Public Comment - Bandon State Natural Area/Grouse Mountain Ranch

Dear Commission members:

This letter is intended to clarify my stance in support of the proposed subject land exchange and to provide additional details which may help you and your staff in making your determination regarding whether or not to include the 1,007 acre Juniper Ridge Ranch in this land swap. I previously stated in my July 20, 2013 letter that back in 2005 I had listed Beech Creek and its fish-bearing tributaries as one of the top five "reference stream systems" on the entire Malheur National Forest in terms of overall habitat the stream and its tributaries provided to Mid-Columbia ESU steelhead and isolated westslope cutthroat trout and redband trout populations. In fact out of the top-five streams on the entire forest I ranked Beech Creek and its fish-bearing tributaries number two (ahead of Camp Creek, Canyon Creek and Murderers Creek) in terms of overall importance as a reference stream to steelhead, redband trout and westslope cutthroat trout and I wanted to put that into perspective for those who may not be aware of the significance of that ranking. Back in 2005 while working for the Malheur National Forest as a district fishery biologist I was asked to name the five most important and/or "reference" streams in terms of importance to fisheries resources. I scoured through various stream survey reports and documents, made numerous field trips and talked with knowledgeable local ODFW biologists and named Beech Creek and its fish bearing tributaries as number two out of the top five on the entire Malheur National Forest.

So in my opinion Beech Creek and tributaries are extremely important overall in terms of habitat and water quality for steelhead, redband trout and cutthroat trout and also for the spring chinook salmon that may enter the lower reaches of the stream. I just wanted you to be aware of the significance of this potential land swap in terms of continued and long-lasting benefits to aquatic resources and I understand that a careful review and fact finding is underway, with budget and public concerns being taken into careful consideration, and that OPRD will likely make the best call for the Oregon public, Grant County, Coos and Lincoln

Counties and the fish, wildlife, plants and heritage sites they are tasked with protecting, sharing and enhancing.

I also noted in my previous letter that the 1,007 acre Juniper Ridge Ranch is currently for sale (which abuts the Grouse Mountain Ranch on the east side of Hwy 395) and I noted that if this property is still available you may wish to also consider including the Juniper Ridge Ranch in this potential land swap because of the biological and overall ecological significance of protecting and continuing to enhance cold water sources flowing into Beech Creek and Little Beech Creek. What I didn't mention in that previous letter was that one of the cold water sources that flows into Little Beech Creek and that heads on this ranch may contain an isolated population of westslope cutthroat trout or redband trout. An investigation would need to be conducted in order to verify what species of trout they are, but I have seen fish in this unnamed tributary to Little Beech Creek which appear to be trout. Additionally, one other important consideration in seriously considering including the 1,007 acre Juniper Ridge Ranch in this exchange is that the juniper ridgetop where the ranch headquarters and guest lodge are located could perhaps provide the "unquestioned best" deer and elk viewing throughout the entire area (possibly even including the entire 6,100 acre Grouse Mountain Ranch) for those who are elderly and/or handicapped and who would find it difficult or impossible to strike out on overland hiking explorations. There are also several badgers which can be viewed at times from the hilltop and a variety of raptors and all types of song birds. The ranch owner also has placed literally hundreds of bird houses of various sizes throughout the entire ranch especially in the riparian zones and as I walked the riparian zones this spring the number and diversity of song birds and woodpeckers was astounding.

The somewhat steep access road up to the Juniper Ridge Ranch mountain-top retreat flattens out on the ridge top where the main lodge and guest lodge are located and overlooks a valley where deer herds and elk herds often can be seen browsing perhaps only 300-500 feet away. They don't stay there all the time, but come and go and so viewing the herds would be hit or miss, but this viewpoint is the best I've seen in this entire John Day area (for a commanding view of open meadows and large herds of deer and elk) aside from perhaps the top of Vinegar Hill which is very rugged and remote to get to. The view to the Southwest from the main lodge is also very good and deer and elk can sometimes be viewed in that direction but at a greater distance and the views of the entire Strawberry Mountain range and Aldrich Mountains are spectacular as well.

I just wanted to make the point that most of this potential future State Park is steep ground and fairly inaccessible for elderly and/or handicapped, with the exception of the bottomlands along the highway, the Little Beech Creek area, and perhaps the Gordon Lakes area (which I've never been to) and this hilltop area on the Juniper Ridge Ranch where these herds (when they're there) can literally be viewed while sitting on the deck which would provide those who can't get around as well with spectacular wildlife viewing opportunities. In fact I think the possibilities for wildlife viewing on the Juniper Ridge Ranch are even better then those on the ODFW Phillip W. Schneider Wildlife Area and Murderers Creek area in the nearby Aldrich Mountains.

Also, I know it can be expensive but a paved foot access/utility vehicle access trail could be constructed from the hilltop parking area/ranch headquarters down to nearby Mary's Reservoir for handicapped and elderly where there is a dock and swimming possibilities for those who are able. There is enough room on the Juniper Ridge hilltop such that numerous small outfitters type cabins with bunk beds could be built so as to be rented out for visitors and bring in an income and also to provide limited overnight facilities, say with a central restroom for the 10 or so small cabins that might be constructed along that ridgetop. Also, I might have mentioned in my previous letter that adding the Juniper Ridge Ranch to this proposal would balance out access to include the east side of Hwy 395, where with the current proposal the only real road access to the east side of the highway is for about a mile and a half up Little Beech Creek. While this bumpy, poor access road up Little Beech Creek for the mile and a half is very interesting from a fisheries/riparian perspective, as far as wildlife viewing the Juniper Ridge Ranch hilltop is by far the best location, especially for those with physical limitations who can't hike as much.

Lastly, I also may have mentioned that from the hilltop retreat at Juniper Ridge several day hikes could be undertaken. A trail could head north from the main lodge for about a mile across several ridge tops and a draw which crosses a historic old road, that used to connect John Day with Long Creek in the past, and loop back to the main lodge for a total round trip of about two miles. Another trail could head south and east from Mary's Reservoir up and over a ridgetop and down into a little basin and then continue downstream to two spring-fed ponds where there is a picnic table and lunch stop, then proceed on up and over a small pass with a spur trail to an excellent view point, then down and across another basin and to a point on the main access road where a parking lot could be about 1/4 mile below the main lodge and the trail could continue on from there back up the ridge to the hilltop and main lodge parking area forming about a two mile loop. So much

potential that I wanted to make you and your staff aware of should this property remain available and be considered in the Grouse Mountain – Bandon State Natural Area – Bandon Biota proposal.

If you were to match the Grouse Mountain map with the Juniper Ridge map you'd see that it is a perfectly balanced fit with trail and wildlife viewing access points to both the west of the highway portion, and also the great wildlife viewing location for the elderly and handicapped from the Juniper Ridge Ranch hilltop retreat and trail access points, on the east of the highway portion.

Please note that I'm not commenting just so that the potential State Park acreage would be expanded just for the sake of a larger State Park, but that in my opinion, as a retired fisheries biologist and naturalist, there are real benefits to the biota (in terms of long term protection and continued proper management into perpetuity) and to the Oregon public (through access for research, recreation and soul searching for current and future generations) if this additional land were to become a part of this new State Park, perhaps with a fitting name such as the "Grouse Mountain - Juniper Ridge State Park, Fish & Wildlife Refuge and Ecological Reserve."

Thank you for the opportunity to further comment with regard to the significant biological/ecological benefits and added recreational benefits of including the 1,007 acre Juniper Ridge Ranch lands in this proposal.

Sincerely,

Scott Cotter

Scott Cotter
John Day, Oregon

cc: Grant County Judge – Scott Myers
Congressman Walden

Chris Havel - Bandon Land Swap comment

From: "vines art glass" <vinesartglass@charter.net>
To: <ben.fisher@state.or.us>
Date: 7/26/2013 9:08 AM
Subject: Bandon Land Swap comment
CC: <chris.havel@state.or.us>

Hello,

My name is Bryce Dimitruk and I have been a resident and local business owner in Bandon for 10 years. I am writing today to express my overwhelming opposition to the land swap proposed by Bandon Biota and to request that it is denied. My family and I have been enjoying the new river area weekly for many years I jog to the mouth of the river from the china creek parking lot bi weekly, take my children to the lost lake at least once a week and i have even floated the entire length of the river from the Flores lake outlet all the way to the new river outlet on many occasions. This is a very sensitive ecological area and the river although it is a fairly low flow river that only spans for a few miles it is the home of a very large cutthroat and sea run cutthroat trout population, a native steelhead population and even a good size run of Coho and Chinook salmon.Last year i was able to witness the run of coho salmon while I stood in the mouth of the new river and it was nothing short of magic to see and hear a hundred salmon flood into this tiny river. This area is also the resting point for hundreds of water fowl and even hunting grounds for an occasional bald eagle. There is an abundance of sensitive wildlife located in this small low flow river system that depend on the water run off from the entire area and also the natural buffer from humans that this property maintains .I do not believe there is not enough water to support this golf resort and maintain proper flow of the river and the proximity to the river leads to the possibility of fertilizers and pollution reaching the river system. This area is treasure and should be keep in its natural state for all of the people of Oregon to enjoy for many lifetimes. I hope in the future my children will be able to enjoy the view of lines of geese flying in to land in this area not a line of cars .

I do believe that there are many fellow residents of Bandon that would agree with me but have not yet had there voice heard, for this reason I am going to put together a petition and collect as many signatures as I can to prove that this special place is enjoyed and treasured by many. If you could give me a ruff deadline by which i should have this petition submitted that would be very helpful.

I appreciate the impact the Bandon Dunes has had on the local job market and the donations the Bandon dunes have given to the local schools and I am not against as many golfing locations in Bandon as possible but not in this area or any area that borders the New River/Flores lake reign

I would urge you to review you mission statement on the back of your business cards and hopefully the panel that makes the final decision will come to understand that this location of the proposed land swap is in fact an outstanding natural, scenic, cultural, historic and recreational site that should be protected for our children's children.

This land swap does not meet the requirement of overwhelming benefit to the public and should be denied!

Thank you for your time and understanding and feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this letter or any of my experiences in the new river area

Bryce Dimitruk
541-347-2652
contact@vinesartglass.com

OPRD Publiccomment - Bandon Natural Area

From: Linda Tarr <lindatarr@frontier.com>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 7/26/2013 12:45 PM
Subject: Bandon Natural Area

Below is a print copy of my statement from the July meeting of the Parks Commission in Coos Bay

Dear Parks Commission Members,

First, I want to thank you for your service in protecting and overseeing Oregon's invaluable State Parks. The continued preservation of natural wild places, open to the public, is something which distinguishes Oregon as a place which is not only endowed with an extraordinary diversity of natural beauty, but also with the history of a citizenry which has repeatedly chosen not to sell out to the highest bidder. This legacy of wild beauty has been insured through the foresight and hard work of individuals such as Tom McCall, Samuel Boardman and Oswald West, joined by the widespread support and approval of Oregon's voters and taxpayers.

Now we are faced with a proposal, the specific details of which I am eager to learn. It appears preliminarily that one of the public's wild places near Bandon could become yet another very special golf course. The person making this proposal has earned a reputation as a community-minded person who is also a good steward of the land he has purchased and developed into golf resorts, and I respect those qualities and the economic benefits they have brought to nearby communities.

But I urge and trust you, as public servants, to judge this 'deal' in the context of the ever increasing value of wild places as our state becomes ever more popular, ever more peopled, and ever more altered by development.

It is hard to imagine that, 50 years from now, we will regret that there were only, how many, six? golf courses near Bandon, instead of seven? But we and our descendants may feel deep regret if there are not any Snowy Plovers here, for loss of critical habitat. And we will feel a loss if we aren't able to see and celebrate the triumph of wise and careful restoration and continued stewardship of a rare natural dune system, in the face of that most awesome foe, gorse.

The case for this land swap will be made in terms of dollars; economic benefits for a state struggling to meet many budgetary needs and the promised benefits for the nearby community. I have no doubt that if this one goes through, there will be no end of subsequent proposals near other communities who have their own economic struggles and aspirations.

But I am trusting you all to make careful and visionary consideration of this proposal in light of the larger context, the legacy of natural wild places, open to us all, which need our continued stewardship and which offer a return which cannot be measured in dollar amounts, but whose value to the public is intrinsic to what I love about Oregon.

Thank you.

Linda Tarr
Port Orford, OR

3415 Commercial Street SE, Suite 117 Salem, Oregon 97302 • 503-399-1701

July 24, 2013

Commissioners
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
725 Summer St. NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Oregon Parks and Recreation Commissioners:

The Oregon Farm Bureau (hereinafter "OFB") submits the following comments to the proposed land exchange between Bandon Biota and Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (hereinafter "ORPD"). OFB opposes the proposed exchange because it removes land from agriculture and natural resource use, it lacks local support from all affected local governments, the proposal does not satisfy the overwhelming public benefit criteria as required by 736-019-0060(4), it is counterproductive to criteria for public land acquisitions pursuant to OAR 736-019-0060, and the proposal does not fulfill the policy objectives as set forth in OAR 736-019-0040. For these reasons and as explained below, OFB requests that the Commission not support Bandon Biota's proposed exchange.

Bandon Biota's proposed exchange contains several critical flaws as presented, both in substance and process. Substantively, the exchange would remove 6,100 acres of agriculture and natural resource lands from Grant County's tax base and reduces private land availability purchase or use. As you may know, Grant County's tax base is already stressed due to depressed timber harvest and public land ownership of approximately 70%.[1] Furthermore, local ranchers are hard pressed to find available land to graze cattle and support local ranching operations. The proposed exchange would remove more land from the tax base, reduce natural resource land availability, and add to the millions of acres already owned by State and Federal government entities. All of which do not support Grant County agricultural communities.

Additionally, the proposal contradicts the criteria for acquisitions as set forth in rule. OAR 736-019-0060 states in relevant part:

> *(2) "The purpose of the Department and the public's interests are served when an acquisition satisfies one or more *** objectives:*
> *(a) Protects areas of outstanding natural, scenic, cultural, historic and recreational significance for the enjoyment and education of present and future generations.*
> *(b) consolidates state park parcels***.*

[1] Grant County Court Letter to Tim Wood, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department dated July 12, 2013.

*(c) provides a buffer to adjacent or nearby development***.*
(d) provides access to recreation areas , and
(e) addresses opportunities that may be lost to the Department if acquisition is delayed."

The proposal to acquire Grouse Mountain Ranch not only fails to meet the above-mentioned qualifications, but the exchange as a whole is counter-productive to current rules and policies. The Grouse Mountain acquisition unnecessarily adds thousands of acres to the millions of government owned lands. Regionally, there are sufficient public access points and the Department has not established the need for more access points or public lands in Grant County. Moreover, the Bandon State Natural Area (hereinafter "SNA") land that the State would lose by exchanging it with a private developer is counterproductive to the goals of consolidating state park parcels, providing buffers from nearby development, and protecting anything of natural, scenic, cultural, historic or recreational significant. All of which are inapposite of the criteria for State park acquisitions.

Next, Bandon Biota's proposal fails to satisfy the criteria for public land exchanges as required by OAR 736-019-0070. The rule states:

"(4) To approve an exchange that a party other than the Department initiates, the Commission shall determine that the proposed exchange provides an overwhelming public benefit to the Oregon State Park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon."

As proposed, the exchange falls well short of demonstrating an "overwhelming public benefit" to the park system or the citizens of Oregon. First, the proposal lacks the support of at least some affected local governments.[2] Second, the acquisition does not contribute to the park system because is removes land from the SNA, an established park. Third, it reduces available agriculture and natural resource lands from productive use in an area that is already primarily owned by government entities. And fourth, some of the lands the State would acquire as a result of this exchange are not accompanied by long-term stewardship endowments. In light of the many budgetary constraints this state faces, the department has not demonstrated the ability to maintain these lands as a park. Together, the facts do not add up to an "overwhelming public benefit."

Furthermore, the process of approving this exchange must meet certain criteria as set forth in Oregon Administrative Rules. OAR 736-019-0070 provides in part that:

"(3) For exchanges that party other than the Department initiates, the Department will:
(a)Determine whether the exchange aligns with the Department's mission, strategies, objectives and work plan,
*(b) Inquire whether the local county and local communities support the exchange, ***."*

[2] See Grant County Letter.

In this case, the Department has done neither. OPRD has not sought approval from the Grant County Commissioners and it is unclear whether any local county or communities support the exchange. In addition, the proposed exchange does not align with the Departments mission, strategies or objectives. For example, the policies in OAR 736-019-0040 require that the department "conduct real estate transactions in an atmosphere of openness, honesty and integrity." As explained by the Grant County Court, there has been no opportunity for any local public comment on the proposed exchange. Furthermore, OPRD has not engaged any affected industry representatives to determine potential impacts that may result as consequence of the proposed exchange. Therefore, the OPRD staff determination that the proposal meets "overwhelming public benefit" was made outside of "an atmosphere of openness, honesty and integrity" and should not be approved.

Alternatively, OFB respectfully requests that OPRD Commission hold a public hearing in Grant County prior to approving the proposed exchange and acquisition of Grouse Mountain Ranch.

If the Commission has any questions or concerns regarding OFB's position, please do not hesitate to contact Mike Freese at (503) 399-1701. Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,



Barry Bushue
President
Oregon Farm Bureau

1040 W. 13th Street
Medford, OR 97501
July 11, 2013

Governor John Kitzhaber
Oregon State Capitol Bldg.
900 Court St. NE, Suite 254
Salem 97301- 4047

Dear Gov. Kitzhaber,

As one of your longtime supporters, I am writing to you out of concern for a proposed exchange between Bandon Biota (a Michael Keiser company) and Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) in Bandon, Coos County. My husband and I lived in Bandon between 1998 and 2006 and were deeply engaged in city and county committees and actions, and I presented testimony on this issue on July 20, 2011.

I understand that Mr. Keiser and/or his employees have met with you about this exchange, and I am writing to let you know I have serious doubts about the proposal, which I ask you to consider before a final decision is made by OPRD.

1. Bandon State Natural Area (BSNA) has been managed for its natural values for forty-five years. It contains rare botanical resources, especially habitat for the very rare Beach Sagewort, which is critically imperiled. BSNA is also home to the federally listed Snowy Plover, and is a habitat restoration area for the plover. The habitat succeeds for these species because the area is quite remote, with little human traffic; a golf course in that space, even though not directly on the beachfront, will dramatically change the habitat. Predators will increase in the wake of greater human presence.

BSNA is a fragile habitat and deserving of full protection by OPRD. The whole of this Bandon State Natural Area (BSNA) provides for the enjoyment of the natural world as it is without development. If these unique and valuable lands were traded away they could never be returned to their natural state or returned to the State park system.

2. OPRD has a new rule that requires "overwhelming public benefit to the State Parks system, its visitors and the citizens of Oregon...which is resounding, clear and obvious" in any exchange proposed by others.

Bandon Biota's exchange proposal is the first time this new rule is being applied. In the terms of exchange, Biota would receive 280 acres of Bandon State Natural Area (BSNA), while the State would receive two small coastal parcels, money to help purchase a third, money for in-kind gorse control services, and the entire funding for purchase of 6,100 acre Grouse Mountain Ranch in Grant County.

The exchange would set precedent for future cases--in this instance that Oregon is willing to cast off cherished natural areas to enable a private business to expand its resort by merely providing money for other purchases. I question establishing such a precedent.

This land exchange clearly does not meet the "overwhelming public benefit" required by policy. State Parks are for the enjoyment of everyone in Oregon and visitors from other areas as well, not just those that are fortunate enough to live close by. I oppose giving any public property to any private concern.

3. The Coastal State Parks are the crown jewel of the Oregon State Park system — the most popular in the state, along with Silver Falls State Park and the Columbia Gorge. Decision makers and citizens are required to weigh the balance of the coastal park system for the benefit of all Oregonians and thousands of tourists, keep a statewide focus, and decide if such exchanges are a good bargain for Oregon. What Bandon Biota proposes is whittling down a major Park in exchange for two non-threatened coastal parcels, some funding for gorse removal and money for a large parcel far from the coast. I ask your agreement with me that the proposal presents a poor bargain to Oregon and its Coastal Parks.

4. Bandon State Natural Area was deeded by the U.S. Dept. of Interior to the State of Oregon in 1968 "for park purposes only." Even if USDI would be willing to lift this deed restriction, it gives the State a black eye to have accepted Federal land in good faith for parks — until such time as turning part of it into a golf course was a better deal in the State's eyes.

If Oregon is serious about nurturing biological diversity, BSNA should remain whole. BSNA does unfortunately suffer from gorse invasion, but no more so than any other south coast land; and gorse can be successfully eradicated over time. The State is the custodian of public lands and required to ensure the general public's access to and enjoyment of all State Park sites.

I ask you to issue a statement to OPRD and the public that you, as Oregon's Governor, do not place a private resort company's expansion plans above the Oregon State Parks system, and especially the cherished

Coastal Parks. Additionally, I ask that you clarify to OPRD that the most valuable action the agency can take is one that preserves the integrity of the Parks system, and sets precedent for the decision-making process in future exchanges that will expand the Park system without whittling away other Parks, sacrificing one for another.

Sincerely,

Carol N. Doty

Carol N. Doty

cc: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
725 Summer St. N.E. Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

OPRD Publiccomment - Bandon Biota Land Exchange

From: Arlys Fones <arlysfones@yahoo.com>
To: "OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us" <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 7/19/2013 8:53 AM
Subject: Bandon Biota Land Exchange

As caretakers of public park lands, please retain this public ocean view natural area for public use and do NOT trade it to private interests for yet another golf course with an ocean view. Please do not let yourselves be influenced by monied interests with arguments in favor of jobs or lesser fees for Oregonians. Do the right thing...keep the ocean view for our children and grandchildren!

Thank you for your attention to this important matter,
Arlys Fones
arlysfones@yahoo.com
503-334-5622
9114 SW Trail Ct.
Portland, OR 97219

54628 Geiger Creek Road
Bandon, OR 97411-8850
July 11, 2013

Governor John Kitzhaber
Oregon State Capitol Bldg.
900 Court St. NE, Suite 254
Salem, OR 97301- 4047

Dear Gov. Kitzhaber,

According to a May 13, 2013 article in Golf Travel Insider, Keiser already owns sufficient land in the area for the new golf course he would like to build; the 280 acres of BSNA would merely be used to make the new golf course "superlative" rather than "pretty good." This is certainly not a reason for the State of Oregon to give up 280 acres of a prized natural area, in an area where golf courses are now common (Bandon Dunes has five at its resort already) and coastal solitude becoming increasingly rare. Bandon State Natural Area (BSNA) would be quite different with a major golf course at its back, since the park would provide much less of a buffer for beachgoers after the exchange was completed.

This exchange proposes to grow the State Park system by robbing Peter to pay Paul: the state receives funding for several other parcels only by giving up a large chunk of an existing park. As a policy matter, this is not a good way to build the State Parks system. If Grouse Mountain Ranch should be a part of the State Parks system – and it appears that it would be an excellent addition – then we should all work together to make it happen in the "Oregon way" without sacrificing one park for creation of another.

The removal of the gorse as proposed by Bandon Biota is not necessary. The State park system already has a gorse eradication program in place and working throughout the entire system. The fact that the State program has not gotten to this natural area should not be viewed as an inducement to complete the land exchange.

The appraisal of the land offered for the exchange by Bandon Biota states that of the total 111.3 acres offered

almost 34 acres are beach lands and 25 acres are submerged by New River. The appraiser defines only the upper 52 acres as useable property. Because the entire 111 acres were valued at $800,000 even though only 52 acres were actually considered useable, this means the appraiser thinks useable upland is worth about $15,000 an acre.

In contrast, the appraiser values the same type of upland acres in the adjacent BSNA at $4400 per acre. If you value the BSNA upland at the same $15,000 per acre for useable land, then the 208 acres of natural area wanted by Bandon Biota, are worth $3.12 million.

No matter how many additional parcels may be added to the proposed exchange, I believe the basic value of these BSNA lands is in their present state. The real value of this land as natural habitat cannot be determined simply on the basis of how easily the land can be developed. If you insist on using development as the yardstick then the value is at a minimum $3.12 million.

The trade of this land will remove it from the public trust and give it to a private concern for use as a 'for profit' development that serves a small minority while ignoring the general population. In my opinion, even if this proposed golf course offered "free green fees" every day it would not provide for the quality family recreation currently found in the State Park system.

The proposal from Bandon Biota certainly would not meet the requirements of the OPRD new rule that requires "overwhelming public benefit to the State Parks system, its visitors and the citizens of Oregon...which is resounding, clear and obvious" in any exchange proposed by others.

Sincerely,

Roberta Stewart

Roberta Stewart

cc: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
725 Summer St. N.E. Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Grant County Farm Bureau
P.O. Box 472
Kimberly, Or 97848

Oregon State Parks & Recreation
Tim Wood, Director

Grant County Farm Bureau is in opposition to the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department's (OSPRD) proposed acquisition of the Grouse Mountain Ranch parcel (Property) as part of the OSPRD's proposed Bandon Biota Exchange Proposal (Project).

We can see no positive impact this land exchange will have on agriculture or the citizens of Grant County.

Since this land exchange greatly effects the citizens of Grant County we are requesting a Public Hearing to be held in John Day, Or.

Respectfully Yours,

Jeff Thomas
President GCFB

Chris Havel, Director's Office
Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission
725 Summer Street, Suite C
Salem, Oregon 97301

July 16, 2013

Re: Bandon Biota Proposal

Dear Director and Commissioners,

The proposed Bandon Biota exchange of real property and funds for a portion of Bandon State Natural Area for a 27-hole golf course is a win for our coastal community, the Oregon State Park system, visitors and citizens of Oregon. It is certainly clear and obvious that the public is not currently using the 280 acres at issue in the Bandon State Natural Area because it is mostly covered in gorse and has limited public access.

Bandon Biota will be contributing to the control of the noxious weed, gorse that is so invasive it is continuously doing more damage by not allowing the native beach plants and dune species to thrive and stabilize the dunes.

The local economy will certainly be boosted from the jobs that will be created to build the course and the continued jobs required to maintain and operate the facility. State wide, this land exchange could result in an increase in the number of jobs in other portions of the State as well.

The numbers of visitors to the Bandon area will only increase with this added public attraction. By doing so, there is an overwhelming benefit to the local Bullards Beach State Park because of the 97 additional acres for visitors to enjoy.

Oregon Parks and Recreation will receive 111 additional acres of oceanfront land that adjoins the Bandon State Natural Area to the south and west to further secure a more protected area for the Snowy Plover habitat.

The Whale Cove acquisition secures the property will be managed for its natural beauty, scenic value and provide a critical marine habitat for coastal wildlife. It will also protect the property from future development.

The additional $2,500,000 purchase of Grouse Mountain Ranch for a new State Park benefits everyone in the State. It will not only provide significant value to the park system but will also create more State jobs for park rangers and managers of the property.

In conclusion, the Parks system will be enhanced with a brand new public park, the Park system will benefit with more funds to significantly fight the noxious weed gorse, 111 oceanfront acres will be added to the Park system and protect more area for the Snowy Plover and more jobs will be created for the public to enjoy more of what Oregon has to offer on the west and east sides of the State.

I sincerely appreciate the generosity of Mr. Mike Keiser, and what he is personally offering to the public in terms of land and funds to keep Oregon beautiful and open to everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to testify in favor of this exchange. I am a Bandon resident, Oregon tax payer and neighbor of the beautiful Bandon Dunes Golf Resort and use their public hiking trails on a monthly basis.

I sincerely hope that the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission finds a unanimous vote in favor of the above exchanges to meet the overwhelming public benefit standard.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Juliette Jones
89056 Whiskey Run Lane
Bandon, OR 97411

July 15, 2013

David and Sharon Comden
59045 Seven Devils Rd.
Bandon, OR, 97411

OPRD
ATTN: Chris Havel
725 Summer St NE
Salem OR 97301

Request for comments on proposed OPRD/Mike Keiser land swap.

Dear Chris:

We support the proposed land swap as the public benefits are many:

1. The land being offered by Bandon Biota will complement existing and accessible Bullard's Beach/Coquille River frontage, a much more useful area compared to the relatively unusable strip desired by Bandon Biota.

2. The Bandon State Natural Area (BSNA) is far from natural in its present state because it is covered by the introduced and invasive gorse. Bandon Biota will restore the area by managing invasive species like gorse and European beach grasses, thereby improving the local ecosystem.

3. Bandon Biota has offered to remove gorse from and maintain the BSNA lands adjacent to the desired parcel in a natural state, at no cost to the taxpayer, so the entire ecosystem will benefit from this improvement.

My wife and I don't, and never will, play golf. We have never met Mr. Keiser. So why should our opinions be considered when commenting on this land swap?

- We have owned and lived on 30+ acres about one mile from the Bandon Dunes and Bandon Biota properties for the past 13 plus years.
- We have first hand knowledge about the terrible invasive plant--gorse, its relationship to the environment and the huge fire dangers it represents. Almost all of our property has or had examples of gorse in various stages of growth. (The town of Bandon has twice burned to the ground due to wildfires fueled by gorse.)
- We are familiar with the success Mr. Keiser and his associates at the Bandon Dunes have had in battling gorse and bettering the environment at the same time. We note that these battles have been done with much sensitivity to the welfare of the wildlife on land, lakes, and streams. We have watched as they converted gorse covered waste land into a beautiful and successful golf resort. These lands have become environmental "good neighbors" that benefit all life.
- The Bandon Dunes has constructed and mapped miles of hiking trails that are open to the public, another example of being a good neighbor. The golf resort is part of our community, open for all to enjoy. Perhaps developing a public trail

system could be a condition added to the proposed new courses? Currently, most of the parcel is not good recreational land or habitat.

- We have been active in supporting and trying to better aspects of our community over the years and are familiar with the generosity Mr. and Mrs. Keiser have shown in giving back to our community, sometimes behind the scene.

The gorse reduction, including doing the same on adjacent state lands, at no cost to the state, is especially important because:

- Comments by some who believe stands of non-native and invasive gorse are good for wildlife and the environment are simply not based in fact. We offer knowledge based on years of first hand observation, sweat, blood, expense and broken equipment trying to contain gorse on our property.
- And those that claim the gorse covered lands are "open" may not have tried to walk through mature gorse. It is impenetrable for man or beast. While controlled smaller gorse stands can be a plus for wildlife as they can offer protection from predators, that is not the case for large (several acre) mature stands as seen in the BSNA parcel. As the gorse matures and grows to 10 to 15 feet high, it chokes out all other plants--everything! In fact, you will find very little wildlife because there is nothing to support life other then gorse.You may find wildlife on the edges of these stands, but not in the centers as there is almost no feed to attract or support animals.
- When highly flammable gorse burns, which it will do with certainty at some time, it will destroy the nearby plant and wildlife communities.
- Gorse is very invasive. Wind blown gorse seeds can survive for 40+ years just waiting for sun to warm the soil and sprout. New areas of sun on soil equals more gorse invasion. Gorse has demonstrated that it is the most successful invasive plant in our coastal area. It needs to be controlled for the safety and benefit of both man and wildlife.

All in all, for the above and many other reasons, we support this proposed land swap. Mr. Keiser has demonstrated he can bring good jobs, adhere to environmental regulations, and bring sustainable, clean and quiet recreational opportunities to our community. Bandon Biota has a proven track record as a caring custodian of the coastal environment.

For all of us, including the wildlife, this proposal is truly a win – win!

Thank you for considering our comments.

David and Sharon Comden
Bandon, Oregon

Chris Havel, Director's Office

July 17, 2013

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

725 Summer Street, Suite C

Salem, Oregon 97301

Re: Bandon Biota Proposal

Dear Director and Commissioners:

I would like to go on record as supporting the proposed land exchange between Oregon State Parks and Bandon Biota. There are many reasons why this is a desirable exchange for the citizens of Oregon, such as adding much needed jobs on the depressed coast; blocking up lands along the Coquille River at Bullards Beach State Park and at New River; and creating new State Parks in other parts of Oregon. However, to me, the most important part of this exchange is the opportunity to control the spread of gorse.

Gorse is perhaps the greatest problem facing the community of Bandon and surrounding areas. My family has been recreating at the Bandon Natural Area for more than 30 years. When we first discovered it, open meadows extended for miles from China Creek to Four Mile Creek. Lower Two Mile Creek was a beautiful stream lined with a lush growth of willows and provided great trout fishing. Today, this entire area is covered with a twenty foot tall stand of gorse that has almost completely destroyed the natural values that made Bandon Natural Area so unique.

At the local level, I am sure that the State Parks staff has the best of intentions to restore this place to its former glory. Efforts have started to remove some of the gorse along the high ridge that is part of the proposed exchange. However, I am told that the budget for noxious weed control has been slashed this year, as it has so often in the past. The fact is that State Parks budget will never be able to support the kind of effort it will take to eradicate gorse in the Bandon Natural Area.

The Bandon Biota proposal offers the opportunity for a systemic approach to gorse control. They have demonstrated an ability to suppress and eradicate gorse on their properties to the north of Bandon. They are willing to accept this responsibility in the Bandon Natural Area for the forseeable future. I think we should let them.

Reg Pullen

55966 Prosper Junction Road

Bandon, Oregon 97411

July 17, 2013

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Attn: Bandon Proposal
725 Summer Street Suite C
Salem OR 97301

My name is Jim Seeley, Executive Director of the Wild Rivers Coast Alliance, a philanthropic organization funded by the net proceeds from the fifth golf course at Bandon Dunes Golf Resort owned by Mike Keiser. My remarks will pertain to two elements of the exchange - the conservation benefits of the project and the benefit to the community to be derived from the facilities proposed to be built there by Mr. Keiser.

Conservation

1. The golf holes to be built on the site will be constructed and managed with the same agronomic principles applied at Bandon Dunes Golf Resort.
    a. Gorse management - The proposed golf course will be a working landscape, supporting the gorse control benefits in the exchange agreement. One needs only look to Bandon Dunes as a compelling example of the conversion of what was once unusable land due to gorse infestation to a working landscape of turf grass that attracts golfers from around the globe to play golf on the most highly rated public access golf facility in North America. So successful has the resort been that it has become one of the largest employers and economic drivers on Oregon's South Coast.
    b. Two recent awards made to Bandon Dunes speak to the high degree of conservation excellence in place:
        i. The Golf Digest Green Star Environmental Award announced in November 2012.
        ii. The 2010 Oregon Sustainable Tourism and Leadership Award in recognition of Bandon Dunes Golf Resort's commitment to the KemperSports "Green To A Tee™" program helping it become a leader in environmentally-safe business practices in the golf and resort industry.

WILD RIVERS COAST ALLIANCE
community • conservation • economy

Community

1. The motivation and commitment of Mike Keiser is to make a world class links golf facility that is affordable for all Oregonians. It would be modeled after St. Andrews, Scotland, where golf has been an integral part of the local culture for centuries. To accomplish this, the following facilities will be built;
    a. 27 hole, walking only, championship links course designed by Gil Hanse, the world famous architect selected to do the Olympics course in Rio De Janeiro.
    b. Other facilities: clubhouse, caddie house, putting course, short game facility with par 3 course and practice range.
    c. Why these facilities?
        iii. 27 holes will provide adequate golf opportunities to accommodate both locals and tourists which will enable the following rates strategy;
            1. Coos and Curry County residents over 18 years of age will pay as little as $20 per round;
            2. Juniors (under 18) will pay as little as $2 per round.
            3. Oregon residents who live outside of Coos and Curry Counties will pay a fraction of the out-of-state rate, which will be the same as the greens fees charged at Bandon Dunes.
        iv. Other Benefits
            1. Junior Golf 18 and under. A robust teaching program where juniors will be encouraged to learn the game of golf on the practice facilities and play golf on the par 3 course. Once a certain skill level is reached, juniors will be encouraged to play the on the 27 hole course.
            2. Summer Junior Work Program. Participating juniors will be trained and mentored to become caddies. Once graduated from the Mentor Program, junior caddies will be encouraged to work for the out of state "retail golfers," at rates appropriate to caddie skill level.
            3. College Scholarships. The Chick Evans Scholarship Foundation provides full four year college scholarships to qualified junior caddies. Currently at Bandon Dunes Golf Resort, about 4 junior caddies per year are qualifying for these scholarships. With a robust junior work program at Bandon Links, the number of full scholarships could easily quadruple and grow to 20 or more per year.
2. And finally, profits from Bandon Links will go towards:
    a. Capital Improvement projects,
    b. Scholarships,
    c. Assisting with gorse control in South Coast State Parks, returning them to the uses intended.

Michael J. Scalici
54617 Geiger Ck Rd. Bandon, OR 97411
Bus. 541-290-1520 **migs97411@frontier.com** FAX: 541-347-8374
New Millennium: Natural Resources Consulting & Management
Oregon Coast Wild Harvest

Oregon State Parks Commission

July 14, 2013

RE: Land swap between Bandon Biota and Oregon State Parks

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on this proposed land trade with Bandon Biota.

As natural resources consultant based in Bandon, I am familiar with two of the area properties in the proposed land swap, and on my own recognizance have done assessments of the functional values of the wetlands on these properties using methodologies outlined in both the *Oregon Rapid Wetland Assessment Protocol* (Adamus, et. Al, July 2010) and the *Hydrogeomorphic Assessment Guidebook for Tidal Wetlands of the Oregon Coast* (Adamus, et. al, 2006). Based on results from these assessments, this land swap will be a positive one for the state of Oregon and its citizens.

The 97 acres on the Coquille River estuary's ocean spit that Bandon Biota is willing to trade to the state is a moderately functioning, high value tidal wetland. It has moderate functional value for visiting marine fish and out-migrating salmonid smolts; including the federally-listed coho salmon. Also, this wetland has moderately high function value for waterfowl and shorebirds as well as for sediment retention. Filled in by small caliber drift wood and aeolian sand encroachment over the last few decades, over half of this property's wetlands have been cut off from tidal waters since the 1960's, thus eliminating 15-20 acres of off-channel, high tide refuge and brackish water habitat for coho salmon smolts. As such, It has tremendous potential for tidal wetland restoration which would increase the functional values mentioned above.

Additionally, this property is located adjacent to the popular, heavily used Bullard's Beach State Park and has a horse trail crossing its west edge and a sandy, estuarine shoreline that is often a more tempered beach experience than the adjacent ocean beach on its east edge. It is visited by many people engaging in activities that are compatible with its natural function including kayaking, horseback riding, hiking, educational tours, and birding and is known to contain archeological artifacts. Because of these reasons, this property would be a jewel for the state to acquire.

In contrast with the 280 acres that Bandon Biota would like to acquire, which is mostly upland dunes with dense, impenetrable patches of the thorny, highly invasive shrub,

gorse. It has only about 15-20 acres of interdunal, seasonally-inundated, forested wetlands that are inaccessible to salmonids and scored a "0" for fish habitat and a very low function and value for waterbirds. Additionally, it has much lower accessibility to the public than the Coquille spit property. Thus, the functional value score for these wetlands is very low. Bandon Biota's proposal to cut and maintain the gorse on the adjacent state property will improve accessibility to that property.

Not being familiar with other properties proposed in the deal, I will not comment on them.

Considering Bandon Biota's and Mr. Keiser's record of outstanding land stewardship while improving properties' natural resources and public usage, I support going forward with negotiating a deal that will transfer the 280 acres of State Park property to Bandon Biota.

Once again, thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on this proposed land swap.

Sincerely,

Michael Scalici, *New Millennium Consulting*

REFERENCES:

Adamus, Paul R., Janet Morlan, Kathy Verble, July 2010. Manual for the Oregon Rapid Wetland Assessment Protocol (ORWAP), version 2.0.2.

Adamus, Paul R., 2006. Hydrogeomorphic Assessment Guidebook for Tidal Wetlands of the Oregon Coast, Part 1: Rapid Assessment Method. Produced by the Coos Watershed Association, Oregon Department of State Lands and U.S.E.P.A.,- Region 10. Charleston, OR

Overwhelming Public Benefit? Yes!

After reading an economic impact study compiled by the University of Oregon in early 2010 before Old Macdonald and the Preserve came on line, I've come to the realization that Bandon Dunes Golf Resort is an unparalleled phenomenon, one deserving of everyone's support in the community. Here are some numbers that stuck out to me;

BDGR total payroll in 2009- $10,413,892.

2008 BDGR was the 4th largest employer in Coos County. Today it is second behind Bay Area Hospital.

Cumulative payroll from 2000-2010, $83,159,587. (Development years)

2009 average annual compensation for BDGR employees- $32,133

2008 average annual compensation in Coos County - $30,316

2009 BDGR paid $518,886.70 in county taxes. Only GTE Verizon paid more

2009 BDGR paid a lodging tax of $93,257 to the state.

2008 BDGR spent $4,493,316 on a broad range of goods and services from 210 local vendors

$650,000 given to local causes though philanthropic efforts in 2008 - this amount has continued annually

I believe this land swap is the exact definition of overwhelming public benefit and the benchmark to which any and all future deals of this kind should model after. As a working class father of two, I parallel my family's future on the South Coast with the success of Bandon Dunes. Please, for the future vitality of the area and its next generations, let this exchange happen without delay. Our children and area need opportunities like this to stay competitive in the world today.

While many areas in the country people are rightfully challenging the drilling of toxic, earthquake causing, fracking wells. The 27 holes Mr. Keiser proposes to drill are 4.25 inches in diameter and average 6 inches in depth. I can't think of any less impactful or better use of this gorse-choked wedge of unused land.

I've heard the opposition's worn old charges of "robbing Peter to pay Paul". I disagree; I like to think about this in terms of "Peter being gracious enough to help Paul with a kidney transplant". This is if we continue to drag Peter and Paul into the debate. I bet they both would have thought the world of Mr. Keiser as most in our community do.

Good Day, Brian Kraynik

541-999-6575 btkvet@yahoo.com

Shaun W Robertson
PO Box 242
John Day, OR 97845
(541) 620-0211
swrobertson@centurytel.net

15 July 2013

Oregon State Parks & Recreation Commission through
Tim Wood, Director
Chris Havel, Communications and Research Division
Vanessa R DeMoe, Commission Assistant

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL ONLY TO tim.wood@state.or.us, chris.havel@state.or.us, and vanessa.demoe@state.or.us

RE: PUBLIC COMMENT – COMMISSION MEETING JULY 17, 2013; AGENDA ITEM 6(B)

Dear Commission Members:

My name is Shaun W. Robertson and I am writing to you today in opposition to the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department's (OSPRD) proposed acquisition of the Grouse Mountain Ranch parcel (Property) as part of the OSPRD's proposed Bandon Dunes Exchange Proposal (Project). While I recognize that public ownership of important and significant properties are a valuable tool of the park system, the Property clearly does not meet the statutory criteria for acquisition. Furthermore, due to the superfluous infrastructure present on the Property, the acquisition is not cost effective and the public's money and interests would be better served elsewhere. For these and many other reasons that I would be willing to explain to the OSPRD Commission in detail given additional comment period, I am requesting that the Property be dropped from further consideration.

I am fourth generation from Grant County and have spent significant time on the Property since my grandparents were very close friends of the former Property owner. Currently, I am a natural resource consultant in John Day, with over 25 years experience in fish, wildlife, and watershed management in the John Day Basin and presently serve on the Board of Directors of the John Day Basin Trust, a local, nonprofit land trust composed of local landowners dedicated to the conservation of important lands and resources in the John Day basin. Based on my substantial natural resource management experience in the John Day basin, I am in disbelief that OSPRD purports that acquiring the Property complies with the statutory criteria for public acquisitions or provides an overwhelming public benefit. While the property is scenic and the current owner has completed numerous conservation projects (many with public assistance), there is nothing unique, remarkable or outstanding regarding the Property and, in fact, the Property is no different than any other adjoining or adjacent ranch in the area. The excessive construction and resource-impacting location of the current residence directly conflicts with the rules for acquiring property for the park system and the Property fails to add to or buffer an existing park, address an immediate opportunity that would be lost without acquisition, or fulfill any of the other conditions of OSPRD acquisition.

Frankly, there appears to be no other explanation for the proposed acquisition other than some type of relationship between the Property owner and either Bandon Biota or OSPRD, which relationship fails to

satisfy the conditions and criteria for acquisition. Although the other parts of this Project may remain viable, there can be no other reasonable outcome than for the Property to be dropped from further consideration.

So that I may better understand the Project, I am requesting information regarding the following topics:

- Disclosure of any relationship between the Property owner and Bandon Biota and any document(s) that evidences how the Grouse Mountain Property became involved in the proposed Project, including, but not limited to, correspondence between the OSPRD and the current Property owner.
- A copy of the rating system per OAR 736-019-0060(3) that evaluates the Property relative to the proposed Project.
- A copy of the written environmental review, if any, conducted by the Project proponent.
- Evidence that the OSPRD has, or intends to, inquire whether the local county and communities support the acquisition of the Property.

Please place these comments in the public record related to this Project and provide this correspondence to the other members of the Commission as part of their review of the Project. I would appreciate future notification of the Project to the extent that the Property remains in consideration.

Sincerely,

Shaun W Robertson

cc: Rep. Cliff Bentz
Sen. Ted Ferrioli
Judge Scott Meyers, Grant County
Sharon Rudi, OSPRD Commissioner
Brad Chalfant, OSPRD Commissioner
Grant County Lands Committee
Grant County Farm Bureau
Grant County Stockgrowers

County Court of Grant County
July 12, 2013

Mr. Tim Wood
Oregon Parks & Recreation Dept.
725 Summer St. NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Mr. Wood & the Members of OPRD Commission,

The Grant County Court and the Grant County Assessor would like to formally object to the proposed addition of the "Grouse Mountain Ranch Parcels" in Grant County to the state park system.

Your staff report concludes that this exchange, transfer or purchase of this property would fulfill the terms of OAR 736-019-0070(4) where it states that the exchange needs to demonstrate an overwhelming public benefit to the OPRD system, its visitors and the citizens of Oregon. The Grant County Court which represents 7,450 citizens of Oregon strongly disputes this allegation for a variety of reasons:

1. There has been no opportunity for any local public comment on the proposed exchange.
2. When there are rural counties in Oregon that are on the precipice of financial insolvency this is a horrible precedent to county governments.
3. There has been no research done to ascertain the negative impact on county government, i.e. reducing tax revenues and the potential impact on local Law Enforcement.
4. The potential impact to private landowners that will have to at least augment a percentage of the fire protection rates.
5. The impact on a State government that arguably has significant budget problems and PERS liabilities.
6. There has been to date, no demonstration of significant ecological, geographic, cultural or scenic qualities that would indicate these parcels are exceptional.

Mr. Wood, when the Bates State Park was originally conceptualized by members of the community and the Grant County Court in 2007/2008 it was presented to OPRD with overwhelming enthusiastic public support by the community. OPRD did a thorough public

201 S. Humbolt St, Ste 280 Canyon City OR 97820 Phone 541-575-0059 Fax 541-575-0065

hearing process and also did an exhaustive DEQ evaluation. It is our opinion that the formation of the Bates State Park was an example of the standard as defined in OAR 736-019-0070(4).

It is our contention that OPRD, its staff and Bandon Biota are attempting to circumvent this rule to benefit a private entity at the expense of the citizens of Grant County.

It would be the request of the Grant County Court and the Grant County Assessor that OPRD respects the tenets of transparency and governmental accountability by, at the very least, bring this proposal to the citizens of Grant County with the public hearing process.

We, "the County Court" strongly feel that Grant County has a sufficient amount of public land within its borders (64%) without removing these parcels from private ownership. OPRD has failed in any substantive way to demonstrate the terms of OAR 736-019-0070(4) have been fulfilled.

Scott W. Myers
Scott Myers
County Judge

Boyd Britton
Boyd Britton
County Commissioner

Chris R. Labhart
Chris Labhart
County Commissioner

Lane Burton
Lane Burton
County Assessor

201 S. Humbolt St, Ste 280 Canyon City OR 97820 Phone 541-575-0059 Fax 541-575-0065

Chris Havel - Fwd: Fw: Bandon land exchange

From: OPRD Publiccomment
To: Chris Havel; Jim Morgan
Date: 7/11/2013 8:20 AM
Subject: Fwd: Fw: Bandon land exchange
CC: John Potter; Tim Wood

This came in to the public comment email. Forwarding for response and FYI. Thanks ~ Vanessa

>>> Phillip Nemrava <pnemrava@yahoo.com> 7/10/2013 6:06 PM >>>

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: Phillip Nemrava <pnemrava@yahoo.com>
To: "orpd.publiccomment@state.or.us" <orpd.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2013 5:57 PM
Subject: Bandon land exchange

As long time Coos and Curry county residents we are concerned primarily with how beach access will or could be affected over time. We know that in the past Bandon Biota has expressed a desire to vacate the Whiskey Run Beach access road, and most probably still would like to do so? While we are not opposed to, or in favor of the actual golf course or land exchange, we are very suspicious of those who would have even considered closing such a popular and frequently used access as Whiskey Run Beach.

Does the State have safeguards in place that protect current beach access? Are there any deals buried in the fine print of this pending agreement that would effect current beach access anywhere?

A response would be greatly appreciated.

Thank You,

Phillip Nemrava, President

Coos and Curry Counties Kite Boarder and Surfer Association.
(541) 297-5991

Chris Havel - Fwd: State Parks Land Swap

From: Tim Wood
To: Havel, Chris
Date: 7/11/2013 11:57 AM
Subject: Fwd: State Parks Land Swap

>>> Alex Mitchell <mitchell.alexanderb@gmail.com> 7/11/2013 10:30 AM >>>
Hello Tim,

I saw an article in the Oregonian today about the proposed swap of a portion of coastal land near Bandon, for a piece of former ranch property in Grant County. I'm not sure how much citizen input via e-mail will sway your decision, but I thought I'd offer my opinion.

I'm generally familiar with that area of the coast... we vacation out there frequently... and I'm also familiar with much of central and eastern Oregon due to 4 years living in Klamath Falls and traipsing all over that part of the state.

As it's described in the article... I think this land swap is a good idea. It seems to be a cost-effective use of state resources and I think the public benefit is there. Central and eastern Oregon offers so many opportunities for beautiful parks in an otherwise sometimes (often?) mostly-neglected area of the state.

I know exactly what kind of old ranch bottom-lands you're proposing to acquire. Gorgeous pieces of land, in my opinion. The coastal areas are worth preserving too, but a medium-sized, ecologically-sensitive golf course seems like a fine use for an otherwise gorst-infested dune... especially if the actual ocean-view portion will be preserved for public access.

Again, as an Oregon resident, voter, fiscally-conservative taxpayer, and park-user, I support this land swap.

Sincerely,

Alex Mitchell
Newberg, OR

OPRD Publiccomment - Bandon Biota land deal

From: Chris Luecke <chris.luecke@gmail.com>
To: <OPRD.publiccomment@state.or.us>
Date: 7/13/2013 1:52 PM
Subject: Bandon Biota land deal

To: Parks and Recreation Commission
Re: Land swap deal with Bandon Biota

It seems like the Parks management personnel will have the best perspective on the value of this tradeoff. It looks like the Oregon Parks system will benefit from the exchange, payment of money, and gorse control to me. The area that would be lost does not get extensive use by the public now.

--
Chris Luecke
Lower Four Mile Lane
Bandon, Oregon

OREGON SHORES

CONSERVATION COALITION

July 15, 2013

Mr. Tim Wood, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Director
Parks and Recreation Commission Assistant Vanessa R. DeMoe
Oregon State Parks and Recreation Commissioners
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
725 Summer St. N.E. Suite C
Salem, OR, 97301

Re: Proposed Land Exchange with Bandon Biota

Dear Director Wood, Commission Assistant DeMoe, and Oregon State Parks and Recreation Commission,

Oregon Shores submits these comments regarding the Parks and Recreation Commission's consideration of a land exchange proposed by Bandon Biota for land in just south of Bandon, on the agenda for the Commission's July 16-17, 2013 meeting. These comments hereby incorporate by reference Oregon Shores' comments on the prior Bandon Biota exchange proposal, dated July 20, 2011. Oregon Shores is a private, non-profit organization with members in Coos County and statewide. Oregon Shores' mission is to protect and conserve the natural resources of the Oregon Coast, aid residents in preserving their communities, lands, and waters, and ensure the public's access to Oregon's beaches and natural areas.

Oregon Shores has grave concerns about the proposed exchange of land between

(cont.)

OPRD and Bandon Biota. We do not believe that a case has been made yet that the exchange would be of "overwhelming public benefit," the standard to which all land exchanges involving state park land must be held according to OPRD's own rules.[1] Nor do we believe that there has been a clear demonstration that the exchange "pencils out" even in purely financial terms relating to comparative value.

Oregon Shores strongly urges OPRD and the Parks and Recreation Commission to defer any decision until the situation has been more fully analyzed and the facts are known to the public. OPRD land acquisition policy requires that the Commission "conduct real estate transactions in an atmosphere of openness, honesty and integrity with sellers and the public …."[2] Currently, significant components of the proposal have not been made available to the public. If the Commission renders its decision prior to disclosure of all relevant information, it will not be performing due diligence and risks giving away almost infinitely precious and rare shoreland acreage without receiving appropriate value in return. OPRD should make additional information about the exchange available to the public well in advance of taking any action on the proposal. Otherwise, the Commission will very definitely not have given the public sufficient time to learn the facts and engage in legitimate public debate.

OPRD land acquisition policy requires important analyses and information prior to any decision. Specifically, OPRD policy requires that the department rank and prioritize acquisitions by completing the "Park Acquisition Evaluation" for each property to determine its feasibility and suitability as a state park.[3] OPRD must only acquire property that is "consistent with the department's purpose and its long-range planning goals."[4] Staff has not yet disclosed the information or analysis that supports such a finding. In addition, the acquisition policy specifically requires that a proposal include adequate detail to evaluate the transaction for natural resource assessment, impacts and protection; cultural assessment, impacts and preservation; and overwhelming benefit to the park system.[5] So far, very little information about the exchange, including the exact parcels proposed for inclusion in the transaction, or detail regarding the quality and condition of the ecosystem, habitat, and recreational values, has been disclosed. Oregon Shores requests that the department require the proponent to provide a written environmental review for all lands the department is to receive in the exchange, and make that review available to the public.[6]

For potential land transfers, OPRD establishes the value of the land by an up-to-date appraisal. OAR 736-019-0100(a). An exchange requires transfer land and/or assets of equal value. OAR 736-019-0020(5). Oregon Shores has some questions about the

---

[1] OAR 736-019-0070(3)(f)(C)
[2] OPRD Policy # PSP.010, Policy 2(c).
[3] OPRD Policy # PSP.010, Policy 5(f).
[4] *Id*. Policy 5(a).
[5] *Id.* Policy 8(c).
[6] OAR 736-019-0070(3)(e)

timeliness and accuracy of the appraisal submitted by Bandon Biota. OPRD Land Exchange criteria require that the appraisal submitted by Bandon Biota be independently verified, be up-to-date, and that it reflect the intended use, not simply the current or best use as identified by OPRD.

For a land exchange involving property of greater than $250,000 value, OPRD conducts an independent valuation unless it determines that the outside party's land valuation meets OPRD guidelines. OAR 736-019-0100(b). According to the land appraisals submitted by Bandon Biota, the value of the OPRD land is $910,000, while the value of the Bandon Biota land is $1,020,000.[7] OPRD can rely on the valuation provided by the seller if it meets OPRD appraisal criteria. OAR Land Acquisition Policy (Aug. 22, 2010). Has OPRD either independently verified this appraisal or determined that it meets the standards set out in OPRD's Policy for land exchanges, which includes requiring the appraisal be up-to-date and that it considers the property's intended use? OAR 736-019-0100(i)-(j). Has OPRD conducted an independent appraisal of the lands proposed for this exchange?

Under OPRD policy, "appraisals upon which offers are made shall be dated as close in time to the expected closing as possible, and not be older than one year." OAR 739-019-0100(i). The appraisal conducted for the preliminary Bandon Biota proposal, dated June 5, 2010, is already over three years old.[8] A formal proposal by Bandon Biota would call for a revised appraisal to ensure it is up-to-date and in accordance with OPRD policy for appraisals. Does OPRD intend to have a more recent appraisal completed?

An appraisal must consider the "new, anticipated, or intended use" is that is different from the current or best use as identified by OPRD. The appraisal relied upon by Bandon Biota is based upon construction of a single-family dwelling.[9] Oregon Shores questions whether an appraisal based upon this use is an accurate assessment of the value of the lands for OPRD's purposes. Is a single-family dwelling really the "highest and best use" of the land that is currently part of a State Natural Area and which Bandon Biota intends to convert to a golf course? Did the appraisal take Bandon's Biota's development plans for a 27-hole golf course on this land into consideration when determining the value of the OPRD land? Did the appraisal relied upon by Bandon Biota consider the value of the property's intended use?

In any case, for an exchange to meet the "overwhelming public benefit" standard, the Commission must account for the natural, scenic, cultural, historic, recreational, and operational benefits that are likely to be above and beyond the monetary value of the exchange.[10] If the Parks and Recreation Commission makes available the actual values involved in the proposed exchange, allows the information to be fully and independently

[7] Bandon Biota Proposal (Aug. 19, 2010).
[8] Bandon Biota land Exchange Proposal, 28 (Aug. 19, 2010).
[9] *Id.* at 28.
[10] OAR 736-019-0020(8)

analyzed, and then gives the public sufficient time (months, not weeks) to fully respond, Oregon Shores would not at this time take a categorical position in opposition to the proposal, but would instead consider the full range of potential benefits and impacts, monetary and otherwise. However, if the decision were to be made at this time, the only responsible decision is to reject the proposal, both because it is by no means certain that the exchange would meet even the strictly technical criteria, and because the public has not had a legitimate opportunity to learn the relevant facts and then formulate responses.

The following factors and concerns should guide OPRD's consideration of the proposal and the Parks and Recreation Commission's deliberations.

1. The Bandon-area properties which Bandon Biota proposes to exchange in return for the 280-acre parcel of the Bandon State Natural Area are unquestionably valuable from an ecological point of view. However, their value in calculating the benefits of the proposed exchange depends on whether their resource values would be lost unless they came into public hands. If they are not effectively developable, then acquiring them would have little public benefit. Oregon Shores members familiar with land use in the Bandon area contend that little is actually being gained in this exchange, because the properties to be traded won't be developed in any case. This is the crux of the matter, in terms of determining the financial balance of the exchange and thus the "overwhelming public benefit." No decision should be made until this question has been thoroughly vetted by independent experts.

2. Coastal shorelands in public hands are scarce and of extremely high value—even those currently overgrown with gorse. Land located in eastern Oregon should have absolutely no place in an exchange that would involve loss of coastal lands. The "Grouse Mountain" parcel has zero value in determining the public benefit in this situation. OPRD is responsible for conserving the resource values of public lands, not simply for providing recreational playgrounds; the lands in eastern Oregon, however conveniently situated for park development, do not constitute a scarce resource, and would not in any way compensate for the loss of coastal shorelands. OPRD has a special responsibility for maintaining the legacy of Sam Boardman, the agency's founder, who considered coastal lands and access to them the linchpin of the state park system. The eastern Oregon property must be left out of the equation.

3. The property proposed for purchase at Whale Cove is indeed coastal, and highly valuable to the public. However, before its value is considered in weighing the public benefit of this exchange, OPRD must clearly answer whether the funds offered by Bandon Biota are in any way essential to this purchase. If the company's financial contribution simply facilitates a transaction that would happen anyway, ultimately having the role of simply freeing up funds that will later be spent on some other property lower on the priority list, this too should be left entirely out of the equation.

4. There has been great emphasis on the fact that the 280 acres to be surrendered by OPRD is covered with gorse and currently of low habitat or public access value. The

long-term future of this land must be considered in weighing the public benefit. If it were doomed to remain perpetually degraded by invasive species, then indeed its value would be relatively low. But if restoration is possible at a reasonable cost, or if in fact there are plans to conduct such restoration, then the value of this land must be considered in terms of the natural habitat and desirable open space it can become. The Commission has the authority to sell, lease, or exchange of real property if in the opinion of the department it is no longer needed, required or useful for department purposes.[11] The framework for this proposal does not demonstrate or explain why the BSNA parcel is "no longer needed, required or useful" for the state parks system.

5. There must be a careful and thorough analysis of the potential impact of the proposed golf course on what would then be the adjacent lands of the remaining Bandon State Natural Area. Would there be direct access by golfers and other visitors on the public land in what would otherwise be a remote area? Would there be potential impacts on current or potential snowy plover nesting areas, or on other species of concern? Would there be light or noise pollution? Would chemical pollution (herbicide or other) be a possible threat to the public lands? Would irrigation of the golf course affect the water table, or water flows affecting public lands?

Golf courses have potentially negative impacts on the surrounding area, including impacts to groundwater and wildlife habitat, and pollution issues. Visitors to the golf course will likely want to visit the beaches and headlands and this could be disastrous for the endemic and sensitive wildlife species. Garbage and waste associated with the large development will inevitably lead to an increase in opportunistic species, such as raccoons, which will just as inevitably move onto the BSNA, imperiling a host of nesting seabirds. The golf course may also allow invasive species to proliferate, endangering fragile endemic plants in the area. Crows, raccoons, and opossums, which are known to interfere with seabird populations, will have increased access and will likely become nuisance animals. Increased activity by visitors could also interfere with wildlife activity on the natural area.

The Bandon Dunes Golf Course requires the treatment of domestic sewage and production of Class B recycled water. Since 2002, they have been issued four Notices of Non-Compliance with their water permit issued by DEQ. [12] This history raises questions about whether this area and the adjacent park area will be properly protected. Oregon Shores requests that the Commission conduct a careful review of the ecosystem impacts of the proposed trade.

OPRD must determine the impact to natural resources from any proposed exchange. The proposal submitted by Bandon Biota acknowledges the threat posed to the Western Snowy Plover from predatory species and human activity.[13] The result of the

[11] ORS 390.121(3).
[12] *See* DEQ Proposed Renewal of WPCF Permit for Bandon Dunes L.P. (May 7, 2010).
[13] Bandon Biota Land Exchange Proposal, 24 (Aug. 19, 2010).

proposed development would be increased human traffic in the surrounding area. An increase in human activity can also lead to an increase in scavenger species, such as skunks, raccoons, and foxes, all of which pose a threat to the snowy plover. Both of these factors have the potential to harm snowy plover habitat and pose threats to the species survival. OPRD has invested a great deal of time and expense in developing and participating in a recovery plan for the Snowy Plover; the Commission must take great care to assure that this effort not be jeopardized before giving consideration to the proposed exchange.

While the Bandon Biota proposal discusses potential impacts to the Snowy Plover, it fails to provide information on the impacts on other wildlife and plant species in the area, including the Beach Sagewort. What measures would OPRD envision as part of any trade to ensure protection of wildlife habitat and sensitive plant species on the BSNA? These should be clearly set forth for public consideration in advance of a public comment period.

6. The long-term effects of losing the 280-acre parcel must be considered. With sea level rise and increasing storm surges, much higher rates of coastal erosion are anticipated in coming decades. Is there a possibility or likelihood that the public shoreline in this area will be eroded back, such that the parcel in question might acquire increasing value as it becomes more immediately adjacent to the beach? Might this parcel eventually be needed to allow the shoreline to move back and still remain public? Moreover, there is a very high probability of a major tectonic earthquake on the south coast in the relatively near future (decades). The result of such tectonic quakes is that the land drops relative to sea level, typically by three feet or more. This kind of alteration of the shoreline might well cause the portion of the BSNA under consideration for the trade to become more valuable. Conversely, a tsunami, an earthquake, predicted sea level rise and increased storm surges may all cause the land Bandon Biota proposes to trade to become less valuable, and very possibly leave it underwater. The Commission should weigh the long-term values of the parcels in question in light of the risks posed by predictable natural hazards.

7. The intended use for the state lands sought in the exchange is relevant only in terms of how it might impact adjacent public land. The fact that the announced plan is to develop a golf course is not relevant in terms of regarding this as “recreation” and thus somehow beneficial in terms of OPRD’s mission. There is no certainty that the property would remain in this use. The area has a superabundance of golf courses, so it can scarcely be said that this use would meet some compelling public need. Beyond stating this obvious fact, Oregon Shores isn’t taking a position on golf—the point here is that the Parks and Recreation Commission should not take this use into account either, whether favorably or otherwise. The only relevant consideration is that the land would pass from public control and become available for private development. (As noted above, the intended use can be relevant in terms of assessing the ultimate monetary value of the land to be traded, but that is a different issue.)

8. Oregon Shores has long held the principle that public lands, and especially state parks, should have buffer zones—that rather than allow development right up to their boundaries, so that the public land in effect becomes an amenity for the private development, at the expense of solitude, scenic vistas and habitat values to the public, these lands should be shielded by buffer zones required of adjoining property owners who wish to develop. OPRD is to consider whether acquiring a parcel will provide "a buffer from private development that may diminish the recreation or conservation values of a state park parcel" in evaluating an exchange.[14] In this case, the Commission is being asked to approve a land exchange that would move in the opposite direction, removing the effective buffer created by the little-used land in the 280-acre parcel. If the proposed development by Bandon Biota is allowed to occupy the entire parcel sought in the exchange, then the public shoreland area remaining would have no buffer. If the exchange is to be considered, OPRD and the Parks and Recreation Commission should very carefully examine the possibility of requiring a buffer zone—on Bandon Biota land—between the developed area and the Bandon State Natural Area.

Conclusion

Oregon Shores appreciates the opportunity to comment on this proposal, and looks forward to the opportunity to review more details about the land exchange. Oregon Shores remains willing to consider whether the proposed exchange will be of overwhelming net benefit to the parks system and the public. However, the public has not yet been provided with the information that will make this judgment possible. We state in the strongest possible terms that this matter is not yet ripe for decision, and that if a decision is made now it must be to reject the proposal. Oregon Shores asks that the Commission consider the evaluation criteria carefully and take appropriate measures to ensure that OPRD's policies are carried out to the fullest extent in considering this proposed land exchange.

Sincerely,



Phillip Johnson
Executive Director
Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition

[14] OAR 736-019-0060(2)(c)

NATIONAL COAST TRAIL ASSOCIATION

PO Box 11045 – Portland, OR / www.CoastTrails.org / 503-335-3876

"Keeping the Coast for Everyone"
through advocacy, education and action
for public access, trails and coastal preservation

July 14, 2013

Oregon State Parks Commission
725 Summer Street NE, Suite C
Salem, Oregon 97301

The purpose of this letter is to **provide the *Oregon State Parks Commission* with our comments** on the **proposed exchange with *Bandon Biota*** regarding an exchange of real property and funds for 280 acres of the *Bandon State Natural Area*.

Given that . . .

- Our organization's mission is **"Keeping the Coast for Everyone"** through advocacy, education and action **for public access, trails and coastal preservation.**
- The mission of the ***Oregon Parks and Recreation Department*** is to **provide and protect outstanding natural, scenic, cultural, historic and recreational sites for the enjoyment and education of present and future generations.**
- And, our organization's global ends policy includes developing . . . **a continuous and well-maintained coastal trail system . . . with protected natural and cultural resources . . . to serve the public . . .**

. . . we **believe our comments are consistent both with our mission, and also that of the *Oregon Parks and Recreation Department,*** plus some of the ends we are both working to achieve along the Oregon coast.

The development of the Oregon State Park system, especially along the Oregon coast, has been the result of growing its land base over many decades, through acquisition and donation, thereby not only providing for present but also for future generations. The **pro-active long-term vision of past park directors, like Sam Boardman, and Oregon State Park Commissioners has made all the difference** in making Oregon State Parks what they are today, and what they will be in the future.

The value of the Oregon State Park system, especially along the Oregon coast, not only relative to tourism **in contributing to the state and local economy, but also in providing recreational opportunities and quality of life benefits, is significant.** Another value of the state park system is in **protecting wildlife habitat and natural open space. The protection of existing lands within the Oregon State Park system,** preserving what's already there, as was recently done by the ***Commission*** relative to the *Floras Lake State Natural Area* proposal in Curry County, **is vital in continuing to realize these values.**

Given that . . .

- **Preserving the upland scenic viewshed along recreational trails** is an important component in creating a quality recreational experience for hikers.
- **Protecting and restoring habitat along recreational trails** is an important management approach in enhancing opportunities for wildlife viewing for hikers.

- **Expected continued and significant sea level rise during the 21st-century** combined with resulting **higher storm surges and shoreline erosion** events, plus the geological potential for a **major tsunami event** with resulting **damaging impacts to foredune areas**, could mean the **loss of land** directly parallel to and further inland thereby potentially shrinking the existing land base and wildlife habitat of *Bandon State Natural Area*.

- **Loss of the 280-arce parcel would preclude the use of the land for any future potential state park** purposes to use the land for public recreational purposes such as primitive or other types of campsites with their related facilities.

- **Past donations of land to the state park system have been mad**e, as in the case of a gift of 367 acres of land in 1950 by Borax Consolidated, Ltd of London, now a part of the *Samuel H. Boardman State Scenic Corridor* along the south coast.

- **And the apparent fact that** ". . . Admittedly, he (Mike Keiser) could build Muni (the proposed 27-hole golf course) on the land he (already) owns, and it could be 'pretty good' . . ."
  (Source: *Golf Traveler Insider* website article/interview re: Bandon Muni by Matt Ginella, May 13, 2013)

Therefore, we specifically . . .

- **Seek the continued preservation and protection of the *Bandon State Natural Area* land base as it currently exists.**

- **And encourage *Bandon Biota***, instead of an exchange of the coastal lands they own, **to make a lasting contribution to the public by simply donating both the 111-acre oceanfront and the 97-acre Bullard's Beach Spit parcels,** thereby growing the Oregon State Parks system for future generations.

Finally, given the former response by the ***Oregon State Parks Commission*** to the initial proposal of ***Bandon Biota***, regarding an exchange of coastal lands for coastal lands, **the past decision apparently meant the original proposal did not meet the criteria of providing an "overwhelming public benefit to the state park system."**

A more general question which might be asked by the *Commission* relative to the current proposal -- and the **apparent precedent-setting decision** that would result -- is "Does the Commission agree to an "exchange of state park land" when money is also offered to fund another state park project, whether on the coast or elsewhere?"

What's seems to be complicating this proposal for the *Commission* is that it goes beyond the simple exchange of land – which was the apparent specific intent being addressed by their existing policy of **"overwhelming public benefit" –** since in this case it **also involves the additional offer** of significant money for other state park projects.

How the Commission interprets their existing policy statement relative to the current proposal and situation will make all the difference, not only to this 280-acre parcel, but potentially and more importantly to the future of the Oregon State Park system itself . . . and generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration, respectfully,

Al LePage, *Executive Director*

cc: Board of Directors, ***National Coast Trail Association***

Oregon State Parks & Recreation Commission
725 Summer St. N.E., Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

RE: PUBLIC COMMENT – COMMISSION MEETING JULY 17, 2013; AGENDA ITEM 6(B) RELATING TO GROUSE MOUNTAIN RANCH ACQUISITION PROPOSAL

July 16, 2013

Dear Commissioners,

I am the State Representative for District 60, which includes Grant County. The proposed acquisition, by the State of Oregon or any non-profit, non-taxpaying entity, of the Grouse Mountain Ranch, if consummated and if not appropriately structured, would cause further economic damage to Grant County. Not only would it have a substantial negative impact upon real property tax and fire suppression revenues, it would also further reduce the economic stability of the County.

Of course, this negative impact could be at least partially offset if an appropriate management plan is in place. Such a management plan would have to include use of the property that at least maintains or improves economic activity and allows use of the property for other economically beneficial actions. Additionally, the loss of real property taxes would somehow have to be addressed. Unfortunately, there has not been a public hearing which would allow local residents to understand the proposed future use of the multi-thousand acre parcel.

The failure of timber policy and the refusal of the federal authorities to allow activity on federal forest and BLM lands (which comprise approximately 70% of the County) has pushed the small rural communities in the County to the brink of fiscal ruin. This proposed acquisition, by a public non-taxpaying entity (State Parks), would only accelerate this economically disastrous process.

On behalf of my constituents in Grant County, I urge you to hold a hearing in Grant County so that local residents concerns can be heard. Absent such a hearing, I urge you to oppose the suggested land exchange.

The standard which applies (strong benefit for all of Oregon) is certainly not met by any part of this proposal.

Again, I urge you to vote NO. Thank you for your service and for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Representative Cliff Bentz
House District 60

July 14, 2013

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission
Oregon Parks and Recreation Dept.
Attn: Chris Havel
725 Summer St. NE
Salem, OR 97301
Email: chris.havel@state.or.us
tim.wood@state.or.us

Dear Chris Havel and OPRD Commission

As a landowner in Grant County, I would like to weigh in on the recently-discovered "proposed land swap". I am adamantly opposed to privately-owned property being taken out of the tax base. Counties like Grant County, that had relied on timber dollars just a few short years ago are struggling to survive because of those tax dollars disappearing. They do not need to have their situation made worse by taking land off the tax rolls.

I am dismayed by the fact two State officials would ask our county judge to keep a matter like this "under his hat". I think these 2 state officials' jobs should be at stake, speaking as a long term taxpayer in the State of Oregon. It is our way of life that is being affected…and our tax dollars that are being used.

Respectfully,

Shannon Rust

Oregon Parks and Recreation Dept.
Attn: Chris Havel
725 Summer St. NE
Salem, Oregon 97301

July 10, 2013

Dear Mr. Havel,

I am writing to voice my opinion and concerns on the proposed land exchange with Bandon Biota, in Grant County Oregon. I am a taxpayer and land owner in this county and am also a neighbor to the property being discussed. Our County cannot stand to have any more property taken from our tax roles. We are nearing destitution now, because of the lack of employment and the ongoing waste of our taxpayer dollars, by our State and Federal government. I don't feel like any form of government needs to own more land, when in reality they are not good stewards of the land they have.

During these tough economic times we need to tighten our belts and direct our efforts to the basic things that are needed to provide us with good fire protection, schools, medical facilities, police protection etc. We are having a difficult time in this county just providing adequate services in all of these departments, without adding another park that will take more tax payer dollars to develop. I thought the state was supposed to be broke. If so, how do we propose to do this? I also don't believe that this park would have an "overwhelming benefit to the public." The property was homesteaded in the 1800's and developed to be productive, working agriculture land. We need to remember that these properties raise the food to feed the people of this great state and nation. Please keep that in mind.

Thank you for hearing me out and I truly hope and pray that you will take my concerns to heart and really hear them. I am not the only one in this county that is concerned about this issue.

I would appreciate a response to my letter regarding the decision made on this issue. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Brooks

Mary Ellen Brooks
P.O. Box 487
Mt. Vernon, Oregon 97865
541-932-4540

PO BOX 488
Long Creek, OR 97856
July 14, 2013

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission
Oregon Parks and Recreation Dept.
Attn: Chris Havel
725 Summer St. NE
Salem, OR 97301
Email: chris.havel@state.or.us
tim.wood@state.or.us

Commission Members

I am a lifetime resident of Grant County, Oregon, and a taxpayer in the county since March of 1966. I am extremely opposed to a land exchange program which was recently brought to my attention. It is my contention that the land in Grant County being considered for exchange has no unique benefits. It will not be an essential part of the Oregon parks division.

Grant County is suffering loss of jobs and population because of the loss of the timber industry in the area. One remaining industry that is still viable is the grazing of livestock. Taking land out of production is not a benefit to Grant County or the state. The reduction in taxes by removing the property from taxation both for county taxes, and fire patrol for Oregon Department of Forestry is definitely not in the best interests of this county.

It is my understanding that this land exchange has been in the making for some six months, and that the Grant County Judge when approached to discuss this land exchange was told by two state agency employees that he was to keep it secret. This goes against all public policy, and is an affront to the residents of the county.

In closing, I once again state this is not an acceptable transaction for the citizens of the county

Respectfully submitted

Sharon E. Livingston
541-421-5276

Chris Havel - Bandon State Natural Area - do not trade it away

From: Margaret Stephens <mlstep@msn.com>
To: "chris.havel@state.or.us" <chris.havel@state.or.us>
Date: 7/16/2013 4:57 PM
Subject: Bandon State Natural Area - do not trade it away

Greetings:

I am writing to urge that OPRD not accept the proposed land exchange that would give Bandon Biota 280 acres of Bandon State Natural Area.

I fail to see how carving away a natural area for another golf course in this area is in the "overwhelming" public benefit. What I see is publicly owned natural areas in a prime site being given to benefit a privately owned business. (Yes, I do understand there would be other lands acquired in this land exchange; however, I do NOT think this is the way to obtain these lands and I question the value received by the Oregon public in this proposed exchange.)

OPRD should continue to obtain land that benefits the public good. OPRD should not trade away any part of this important ecosystem.

I treasure my visits to BSNA. It, and the ecosystem there, needs to be protected and expanded, not diminished.

Sincerely,

Margaret Stephens
Salem, OR 97301

July 10, 2013

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
ATTN: Chris Havel
725 Sumer St. NE
Salem, Oregon 97301

Dear Chris Havel and OPRD Commission:

It is with great concern that I address the draft agenda item 6b, Proposed Exchange with Bandon Biota. As a resident of Bandon and lifetime Oregonian, I do not believe this land trade meets the "overwhelming public benefit" criteria for various reasons.

First of all, the Bandon State Natural Area is a very unique piece of property and irreplaceable. I find it amazing OPRD is considering trading a portion of this property to a "for profit" private entity whose goal is development. This is a highly sensitive area which needs to be protected and maintained for "public benefit". That is why the State of Oregon acquired so many properties along the Oregon Coast years ago. When these original coast acquisitions took place, many of those original landowners actually did not want the "State" to "take" their lands. How can the State justify trading them to a private entity when the State determined years ago that they were so unique, sensitive, and essential for "public benefit"?

Last time Bandon Biota proposed acquisition of this property, OPRD did not approve the land trade. I understand it was because it did not meet the "overwhelming public benefit" criteria. Now that Bandon Biota has sweetened the pot, it is before you again. I find it amazing that according to The World article dated 7/9/2013, Mr. Keiser "does not have enough land to build another golf course or they wouldn't have approached the parks four years ago." Do you know how much land Mr. Keiser currently owns south of Bandon, west of Hiway 101? If not, you need to find out from the Coos County Assessor's office. How much land does it take to build a golf course or is it going to be another "destination" resort? How many golf courses are currently in Bandon? How many can this small community support and is there really a "public need"? Do you really think this development benefits the local community and people of Oregon? How much water will this development require? What will its impact have on those water rights for agriculture use and what will the impact be on water needed for fish habitat? It only takes looking at Klamath to realize currently the importance of "water" in the State of Oregon. What impact will this development have on the fish and wildlife in the Bandon State Natural Area? What will the impact of this development have on the already existing agriculture/timber community south of Bandon? Isn't land planning supposed to protect our natural resource land base from this type of development? Is this type of development compatible next to a "state natural area" and productive natural resource land?

I am adamantly opposed to the conditions of the trade which incorporates the purchase and addition to the "state park system" the 6,100 acre Grouse Mountain Ranch. This property is natural resource land and therefore should be protected under SB100 for ranching/timber and continued private ownership. Our counties are facing financial difficulties and need these lands paying property taxes, providing jobs, and contributing to the local economy rather than going off the tax rolls when it transfers to the State. The cost for management of such a "park" will be extensive adding another cost to us taxpayers of

Oregon. Have you considered the real cost to Oregonians should this acquisition become a reality? Have you considered the impact of this acquisition to the natural resource community in Grant County?

Gorse control is something the State of Oregon should have been doing on their lands all along as well as other weed management. Putting $300,000 into gorse control will do nothing to actually control the gorse unless OPRD has a pro-active gorse management plan in place and a budget each year to maintain control over this invasive. Whether or not you know anything about gorse, you must realize the seeds can lie dormant in the ground for 30+ years. Do you intend to treat these "state natural areas" with herbicides to manage the gorse? How are you going to dispose of these plants? These are huge concerns for us who live in Coos County as this invasive species continues to be spread due to lack of understanding and education of those who do not live in this area.

If your interest is truly "overwhelming public benefit", then you must realize that even though this proposal looks good on paper, the people of Oregon will be losing part of a very sensitive, irreplaceable natural area that every person can now enjoy! The Grouse Mountain Ranch is just another removal of private land into public ownership. There is a cost to Grant County as well as tremendous cost to operate and maintain such a park to Oregon and its taxpayers. Therefore, there is no overwhelming public benefit to this land transaction and it is in the best interest of all Oregonians and the State that the Bandon State Natural Area stays in State ownership and Grouse Mountain Ranch stays in private ownership.

Sincerely,

Sharon Waterman
87518 Davis Creek Lane
Bandon, Oregon 9741

ORCA: Oregon Coast Alliance
P.O. Box 857, Astoria OR 97103
(503) 391-0210 http://www.oregoncoastalliance.org

Protecting the Oregon Coast

July 12, 2013

Tim Wood, Director
Members, Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission
Oregon Parks and Recreation Dept.
725 Summer St. NE, Suite C
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Commission Members and Director Wood,

Oregon Coast Alliance is a non-profit organization whose mission is to protect the Oregon coast by working with coastal residents for sustainable communities; protection and restoration of coastal natural resources; and providing education and advocacy on land use issues.

ORCA writes this letter concerning the proposed Bandon Biota-OPRD exchange on behalf of its members and supporters in Coos County and elsewhere who cherish the Oregon coast. Oregon Coast Alliance has very serious reservations about this exchange proposal, and strongly questions whether it weighs out in the balance as providing an overall benefit to Oregonians and the State Parks system. We are in favor of OPRD's independent acquisition of Whale Cove and Grouse Mountain Ranch when monies become available, presuming those properties continue to meet OPRD's acquisition criteria.

Background

This proposed exchange is similar to that initiated by Bandon Biota in 2010 and 2011, with the addition of monies offered by Bandon Biota to purchase a small but important parcel in Whale Cove, and the large Grouse Mountain Ranch in Grant County. Bandon Biota or associated Bandon Dunes companies proposes to build a golf course, nicknamed 'Bandon Muni,' on the BSNA exchange land.

As before, this exchange falls under the category of "Exchanges Initiated by Other Parties" in the Oregon Administrative Rules that govern OPRD. OAR 736-019-0070(3) states that in such exchange proposals, OPRD will among other things:

- Determine whether the exchange aligns with the Department's mission, strategies, objectives and work plan.
- Inquire whether the local county and local communities support the exchange.
- Determine whether the exchange will accommodate public use and access, and be in the best interests of the Department.

OAR 736-019-0070 (4) directs the Commission to "determine that the proposed exchange provides an overwhelming public benefit to the Oregon State Park system, its visitors, and the citizens of Oregon…which is resounding, clear and obvious." Clearly, this proposal is one which will require careful consideration by the Commission because it is large, complex, and involves a great deal of money and land.

Getting the "Overwhelming Benefit" Rule Off to a Good Start

To the best of ORCA's knowledge, this exchange is the first time the Overwhelming Benefit rule has been applied "on the ground," so to speak. Even if it has been applied elsewhere, this is certainly the biggest test it has faced.

If this exchange is approved, the Commission will be setting a precedent for this Rule that ORCA considers to be dangerous and ill-advised: that it is appropriate to sacrifice one Park for another (or several others). In other words, this exchange paves the way for a policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul. This zero-sum game approach to maintaining and expanding the Parks system is not the way to move ahead. It would be preferable to enlarge the Parks system by collaboration and fundraising to purchase those lands needed for the Parks system, rather than enriching a private business by whittling one Park down to provide the means for others. The "Oregon way" is for parties to a problem or need to join forces, cooperate and find solutions that do not harm one party at the expense of another.

Benefiting the Park System, Visitors and Citizens of Oregon

The Commission must balance the opportunities pro and con in this exchange, and that is a statewide task. But ORCA reminds the Commission that Oregonians cherish the coastal Parks very highly; they are among the most frequently visited in the state. Thus balancing the benefits to all Oregonians must include an analysis of the costs and benefits to coastal Parks. Does this exchange benefit the *coastal* Parks system? ORCA has serious reservations about that.

Michael Keiser/Bandon Dunes already has sufficient land to build a golf course to the east of BSNA *without* the 280 acres of exchange lands, according to a May 13, 2013 *Golf Travel Insider* article (attached to this testimony). The proposed 'Bandon Muni' golf course would be "pretty good" without the BSNA lands; but with the exchange lands the course would be "superlative." This is not an adequate exchange of opportunities for the coast, nor sufficient reason to whittle away 280 acres of BSNA. The State of Oregon should not be in the business of giving its lands to improve the configuration of a proposed private amenity.

BSNA was granted to the State of Oregon by the U.S. Department of the Interior in 1968 "for parks purposes only," as the deed language states. The Bureau of Land Management did not give this land to Oregon for parks purposes merely until it was better in the State's eyes to trade it and allow a private golf course development. Indeed, if OPRD decides to trade a portion of it so that a golf course can be built there, BLM will require OPRD to purchase the reversionary clause in the deed at 100% of Fair Market Value, as current BLM policy requires.

Determining FMV for the reversionary clause is something OPRD must take into account for this exchange, as BSNA is highly valuable in ways not easily quantifiable, for solitude, ecosystem integrity, aesthetics, and similar values. The BSNA lands should be granted a similar per-acre value as the useable acreage at other similar sites, such as the proposed exchange parcel at New River.

BSNA has been managed primarily for its natural values since at least 1968, if not before – forty-five years or more. There are good reasons for this. It has unique botanical resources, especially including the critically endangered Beach Sagewort, which has a Natural Heritage State Rank of S1 "because it is considered to be critically imperiled because of extreme rarity…" As such, it has very high value in a consideration of maintaining species diversity in Oregon.

BSNA is also home to the Federally listed Snowy Plover, and is part of the Habitat Restoration area for the plover. This is in part because the area, which receives low-impact human use, has fewer Plover predators of the sort that increase with higher-impact use and human-generated garbage, such as foxes and crows. BSNA is one of the few areas that offers a sanctuary for this imperiled species, and the State has long managed the land to encourage this.

BSNA was classified by OPRD as a "State Natural Area" in the 1990s. The primary purpose of an SNA is "to protect outstanding, or important portions of Oregon's ecosystems for continued public education, and/or for contributing to larger ecosystem health." Such areas are managed primarily for natural values, and public recreation is encouraged in a natural, undisturbed setting with fairly minimal infrastructure. As OPRD describes it in the agency's classification system documents, "A state natural area is a single large parcel, or a collection of nearby smaller parcels." BSNA is clearly the first of these, a single large parcel managed as required under this classification, for "maintaining long term resource quality. Management will be directed to providing resource stabilization and enhancement…"

Other Benefit Considerations, Including the Gorse Problem

Though OPRD is not in the business of weighing economic benefits of a proposed Park exchange, the Commission must nevertheless consider the situation in Bandon as part of the "overwhelming benefit" to Park visitors and Oregon citizens. The Bandon area

currently has at least five Bandon Dunes golf courses, as well as other private courses. Opportunities for solitary recreation and undisturbed ecosystem are increasingly rare, while golf courses are increasingly common. This is true for visitors as well as residents. If private businesses construct golf courses and/or other amenities on their own land, that is not a matter of state policy; but maintaining the integrity of existing, large parks with strong ecosystem and recreational values is a very important state concern.

Last but not least, we must mention gorse. It is unfortunately true that BSNA suffers from gorse invasion; but this is not a unique problem. Many acres of south coast land, whether State Park, Federal and private, are strangled in this noxious weed, BSNA not more so than other areas. OPRD is implementing a gorse management plan on the fourteen infested coastal State Parks, and BSNA is receiving treatment. OPRD has spent $67,000 on gorse control at BSNA since 2011, and no doubt will spend more, as gorse control requires continuous and longterm strategies to be effective. Gorse does compromise the natural values of BSNA, of course; but the solution is to methodically expand and succeed in a gorse control management plan, which Parks is doing.

Summary

In sum, Oregon Coast Alliance asks the Commission to think very seriously before approving a land exchange that sets the State on the path of sacrificing one Park for another as a means of expanding the Parks system when the opportunity presents itself, and enriching a private business in the process. OPRD has an important mandate to protect existing Parks and expand the system in ways that do not rob Peter to pay Paul, and ORCA hopes the Commission will take these major problems into account before making any decision to approve this very questionable exchange.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify in this matter.

Sincerely,

/s/ Cameron La Follette

Cameron La Follette
Land Use Director

Golf Travel Insider (www.golfchannel.com)

Fate of Bandon Muni may be decided this week; Cabot Cliffs update

- By Matt Ginella
- May 13, 2013 2:09 PM ET

What's the status of Bandon Muni?

"It's no better than 50/50 that this will happen," says Mike Keiser, owner of Bandon Dunes, the five-course resort on the Southwest Coast of Oregon.

Keiser's admittedly frustrated. He has land, money, a vision for a lasting legacy that would continue to positively impact the locals and the local economy, and yet he's having a hard time giving it away. He has been trying to negotiate a land swap with the Oregon State Parks Department for four years. He's set to meet again on Wednesday, May 15, where he says he will make his final offer.

The proposed site of Bandon Muni, which would be home to a 27-hole course designed by Gil Hanse.

Keiser covets a 250-acre gorse-chocked piece of coastal dunesland (pictured above) that's 15 miles south of Bandon Dunes Resort. The No. 1 golf destination in the U.S., as voted by Golf Digest, consists of five courses and 85 holes. In exchange, and in his best estimation, Keiser is offering usable parkland worth four of his dollars for every one of theirs.

So what's the problem?

"There's a cultural divide," says Keiser. "Not to cast aspersions, but they're afraid."

Keiser says state park departments aren't in the business of trading land, especially rare coastal land, and he assumes they're suspicious of his intentions. In a recent article in the Register-Guard, a local newspaper, writer Ron Bellamy told a story of environmental concerns, such as frogs, turtles and birds.

Keiser has always said Bandon Muni would be his philanthropic offering to a community that has afforded him the opportunity to build his dream of links golf in America. Bandon Muni would create another 80 jobs, and cater to Oregonians and locals with affordable green fees and an extensive junior caddie program.

"I see it as a $15-million gift to Coos and Curry County golfers and juniors who don't even know they miss golf," says Keiser.

If he can't get the deal done on Wednesday, he says he'll move on. "The resort will be just fine, thank you."

If he can get the deal done, Gil Hanse, who's building the Olympic Course in Rio, will be the architect. "If it doesn't work, Gil will be just as disappointed," says Keiser, who hasn't spoken to Hanse in six months. "I've been laying low. There's nothing new to report."

Going back to 1999, with the modest opening of Bandon Dunes and a 50-room lodge, Keiser began the foundation of what has become a mecca for avid amateur golfers, with four of the top 25 public courses in the country. In doing so, he has created roughly 1,500 jobs and rescued the tenuous timber industry of Coos Bay. Not to mention the millions of dollars in donations for a local medical facility, schools, the environment and the 60-plus caddies who have gone on to earn Evans Scholarships, which consists of full college tuition to the University Oregon or Oregon State.

"I wish I had better news to report," says Keiser. "Previously, it seemed we were moving forward." Admittedly, he could build Muni on the land he owns, and it could be "pretty good," but if he could turn Hanse loose on a site like the one he wants, "it would be superlative."

Keiser hasn't become Keiser by building 'pretty good.'

Bandon's 'Punchbowl' seeded

Punchbowl at Bandon Dunes Resort

Keiser also told me they've started seeding 'Punchbowl,' the 150,000 square-foot putting course (pictured above), designed by Tom Doak and Jim Urbina. Keiser anticipates a soft opening in September and then, due to the newness of the turf, closing it again in October until the spring of 2014.

I asked Keiser if he was afraid something like the Punchbowl, which will most likely be free and a lot of fun for the competitive types with sore feet and tight hamstrings, would steal business from his other five courses on property. "I don't fear it," says Keiser. "If people are willing to get here, I believe the more things we can present, the better. And I mean it."

To prove it, Keiser says he's also considering a second par-3 course, which would be located in the dunes south of the second hole at Bandon Trails. There's no name or specific timetable for this one, and he hasn't decided on an architect yet, but don't be surprised if it's David McLay Kidd, who built the original 18 holes at Bandon Dunes.

Keiser hasn't considered Kidd for another one of his courses until recently, after they bumped into each other twice in the past six months. Once at the grand opening of Streamsong Resort in Florida, where Keiser says Kidd admitted that in some of his recent designs, he built courses too difficult for what Keiser likes to refer to as "the retail golfer."

Golf.com (blogs.golf.com)

May 16, 2013

New Bandon Muni? Bring It On!

Posted at 1:23 PM by Joe Passov | Categories: Bandon Dunes

The 14th hole at Old MacDonald at the Bandon Dunes resort (Courtesy of Bandon Dunes).

The news from coastal Oregon on Wednesday was encouraging. Bandon Dunes domo Mike Keiser met with the governor of Oregon and the Oregon State Parks Department to discuss the fate of a new course he has planned, tentatively called Bandon Muni Golf Links. “There’s no official announcement at this time,” says Bandon Dunes spokesman B.R. Koehnemann, but sources indicate that the meeting resulted in a preliminary agreement for a land swap to take place that will allow for the creation of the 27-hole course. To that, I say, “Bring it on!”

From Day 1 in the spring of 1999, passionate course connoisseurs flocked to Bandon Dunes Golf Resort, the greatest "must-play" public-course mecca ever built in the United States. So significant was its impact that in 2004, Golf Magazine named it No. 34 of the 45 Greatest Golf Moments of the past 45 years. Since then, Keiser has only enhanced the product, exponentially. Naturally, environmentalists from a fistful of factions have raised stop signs -- or at least caution flags -- but if there's one guy to trust to get things right on the Oregon coast, it's Keiser.

The plan Keiser has in mind is to create a St. Andrews-style muni operation; while his would be privately owned, it would be operated to benefit locals especially, as is the case with how the St. Andrews Links Trust administers its golf offerings. To that end, Keiser acquired several coastal parcels roughly 15 minutes south of Bandon Dunes and hired golf's hottest architect, Gil Hanse, to craft 27 holes. That plan has been in place for at least two, perhaps even three years, and Hanse has completed several preliminary routings. However, Keiser has had his eye on some virtually untouched State Park land, replete with massive dunes, scrubby vegetation and magnificent ocean views that would turn his good golf course into a potentially outstanding one. He proposed a land swap with the state government, but his proposal had stalled -- or at least had been idling for many months. Optimism on Keiser's part had clearly faded -- until now.

The age-old issue of land tampering now rears its head. Do we really need more golf in Bandon? Is it worth it to intrude on such a pristine piece of property? For the state or Oregon to part with such a parcel, there has to be an "overwhelming public benefit," says a state parks spokesman. Keiser makes a compelling case. He's asking for a small slice of an otherwise inaccessible plot that's covered with gorse and other invasive plant species. In exchange he would give up land of equal or greater value, plus cash. He would offer state residents substantial discounts and invite locals from Coos and Curry Counties to play for nominal, even miniscule rates. Juniors would play free of charge and a caddie program will be established to provide jobs for young people.

So long as the bulk of the duneland is maintained in its natural state, this sounds like an "overwhelming public benefit" to me. Thinking that Keiser has kept every promise in keeping Bandon Dunes sustainable and that Gil Hanse embodies the lay-of-the-land, don't-fight-with-nature-but-rather-work-with-it-kind of architect, the Bandon Muni project seems like a certain home run. There remain many hurdles to overcome, but for now, I'm excited to place Bandon Muni on the front burner.

July 14, 2013

Oregon Parks and Recreation Dept.
Attn: Chris Havel
725 Summer St. NE
Salem, OR 97301

Re: Grouse Mt. Land Acquisition, Bandon Dunes Land Exchange

Dear Sirs,

The Grant County Stockgrowers (GCSG) is comprised of over 70 ranching families and local businesses in Grant County, Oregon and we are strongly opposed to the above referenced land acquisition within *our* county that has nothing to do with the Bandon Dunes Land Exchange in Coos County, other than as a puzzle piece in a big money business deal for Michael Keiser's personal gain. We are extremely shocked and disappointed with the secretive nature with which the dealings on the Grouse Mt. acquisition has proceeded within our county and with our elected officials as well as the supposed public servants of the OPRD. We feel we still do not have all the pertinent information regarding this proposal. Of the 6,400 acres owned by Mr.& Mrs. George Meridith, 6,100 acres is the proposed acreage for acquisition by the OPRD. What is proposed for the other 300 acres and the multi-million dollar house that is not accounted for in this proposal? Will the state parks take over the Meredith's' existing "maintenance" burden and create for them their own personal residential "state" park?

The Stockgrowers are concerned with taking private land out of production which also decreases the taxpaying land base in this county. Timber production, livestock production, hay production are necessary for private landowners to pay their taxes and assessments, all of which provides jobs and turns dollars over many times in our local economy. Recreation helps but rarely can generate enough income or provide the jobs that agricultural production does. Taking additional private land out of our tax base increases the tax burden on agricultural landowners who are already being pressured with increased input costs such as feed, fuel, equipment and labor. Fire assessments add to the tax burden of owning private lands which will be spread amongst fewer and fewer private landowners whenever these acquisitions occur. The Grouse Mt. property currently pays approximately $24,000 in farm deferral taxes, $14,000 on the house alone. In 10 years, that is a loss of ~$240,000. Who will support our county services; our schools, our hospital, emergency services, our library, etcetera?

All the benefits: "The property will provide significant natural resources, recreational, cultural and scenic value to the park system" already exist in private ownership. Why does the government need another park in a county that is over 70% public lands? Why does the government want more land? The Oregon government is experiencing cuts to agency funding yet these type of proposals continue to overwhelm the already over burdened taxpayers with the associated costs to acquire, operate (staff) and maintain the excess properties in a time when the State government can't even fund the operation and

maintenance of existing properties. The State can expect annual maintenance costs associated with these 6,100 acres of land which includes existing noxious weed problems that rival the gorse problem on Bandon State Natural Area. Who do you think will end up paying those bills? In short, the acquisition of this property does NOT provide an overwhelming public benefit to the …citizens of Oregon per OPRD land acquisition and exchange policy **OAR 736-019-0070**.

Although the Grant County Stockgrowers Association is in support of private landowners rights to manage and dispose of their property as they feel necessary, our organization is not in support of the continued expansion of government acquisitions that essentially takes private property off our tax rolls and erodes the ability for our county government to support needed services. ***We are opposed to any acquisition or trade that takes one acre off the tax rolls and out of production.***

Sincerely,

Jack Johns
President, Grant County Stockgrowers

Cc Rep. Greg Walden
Sen. Ron Wyden
Sen. Jeff Merkley
State Rep. Cliff Bentz
State Sen. Ted Ferrioli
OCA President Curtis Martin
Blue Mt. Eagle newspaper

Would like to be added to the
* Email notification list
{Maybe touch base w/ him about other info}

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) _____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Hunter Access on the proposed Grouse Mountain Ranch parcel Land exchange

Name: Ty Stubblefield

Date: 7.17.2013 **Meeting Location:** North Bend

Address: 301 Serenity Lane

City/State/Zip: Roseburg, OR 97471

Phone Number: 541-643-5327

E-Mail Address oha_ty@yahoo.com

Organization Represented: Oregon Hunters Association

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) 6.B

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: LAND TRADE

Name: JOHN SWEET / Ch County Commr

Date: 7/17/13 **Meeting Location:** Coos Bay

Address: 1291 N. 9TH ST.

City/State/Zip: Coos Bay, OR 97420

Phone Number: (541) 269-9049

E-Mail Address j.sweet1@charter.net

Organization Represented: Coos County

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS

Nature HISTORY *Discovery*

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) Bandon Biota Exchange

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Exchange

Name: Sharon Waterman

Date: _____ **Meeting Location:** _____

Address: 87518 Davis Ck Ln

City/State/Zip: Bandon, Or

Phone Number: 541-347-3453

E-Mail Address _____

Organization Represented: OFBP

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY *Discovery*

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable)_____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: land swap involving Bandon Natural Area

Name: Lydia Delgado

Date: 2/12/13 **Meeting Location:** Coos Bay OR

Address: 355 Douglas Ave SW

City/State/Zip: Bandon OR 97411

Phone Number: 541-347-8035

E-Mail Address ldelgado@mycomspan.com

Organization Represented:_____

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) _____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: PROPOSED LAND SWAP WITH BANDON BIOTA

Name: MICHAEL SCALICI

Date: JULY 17 2013 **Meeting Location:** RED LION

Address: 54617 GEIGER CK RD

City/State/Zip: BANDON OR

Phone Number: 541-290-1520

E-Mail Address migs97411@frontier.com

Organization Represented: NEW MILLENNIUM CONSULTING

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) 6. b

Do you wish to make a statement?

☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Property exchange proposal - Bandon

Name: Claudia Hundhausen

Date: 7/17/13 **Meeting Location:** Red Lion Coos Bay

Address: 3795 Beach Loop Dr

City/State/Zip: Bandon

Phone Number: 541 347 1312

E-Mail Address hausd@mycomspan.com

Organization Represented: —

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) Land Swap

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Bandon Land Swap

Name: Mike Claassen

Date: 7-18 **Meeting Location:** Coos Bay

Address: 1455 Pelican Place

City/State/Zip: Bandon, OR 97411

Phone Number: 541-347-9585

E-Mail Address mmclaas@earthlink.net

Organization Represented: Bandon City Council

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY *Discovery*

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) 6 BANDON EXCHANGE

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: BANDON LAND EXCHANGE

Name: LINDA TARR

Date: 7/17/13 **Meeting Location:** NORTH BEND

Address: 47255 CEDAR HOLLOW

City/State/Zip: PORT ORFORD, OR 97465

Phone Number: 541 332-1032

E-Mail Address lindatarr@frontier.com

Organization Represented:

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY *Discovery*

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable)_____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Bandon Biota Land swap

Name: Bart Streity

Date: 7/17/13 **Meeting Location:** Red Lion

Address: 87112 Boak Rd

City/State/Zip: Bandon OR 97411

Phone Number: 541-551-0626

E-Mail Address _____

Organization Represented: _____

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature
HISTORY
Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) 6a

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Bandon

Name: Julie Miller, Bandon Chamber

Date: _____ **Meeting Location:** _____

Address: 300 2nd Street

City/State/Zip: Bandon OR 97411

Phone Number: 541 347-3054

E-Mail Address bandoncc@myrcomspan.com

Organization Represented: Bandon Chamber

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) _____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Bandon Dunes property proposal

Name: Sandy Messerle

Date: 7/16 **Meeting Location:** Red Lion

Address: 50 Central Ave (SCDC)

City/State/Zip: Coos Bay, OR 97420

Phone Number: 541-266-9753

E-Mail Address sandy@scdcinc.org

Organization Represented: SCDC

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable)_____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Concern over the trade of BNSA. ~~for~~

Name: Keith Saylor

Date:_____ **Meeting Location:** Coos Bay / Red lion Inn

Address:_____

City/State/Zip:_____

Phone Number: 541-655-0328

E-Mail Address kfsaylor@gmail.com

Organization Represented: Personal

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) 6 b

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Bandon Biota

Name: Julie Jones

Date: 7/17/13 **Meeting Location:** Coos Bay

Address: 89056 Whiskey Run Lane

City/State/Zip: Bandon, OR 97411

Phone Number: 541.347.2528

E-Mail Address

Organization Represented:

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature
HISTORY
Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable)_____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: does State parks own the land south of Bandon?
Meeting at night for working people

Name: Dick Mork

Date: 7-17-13 **Meeting Location:** Coos Bay OR.

Address: Po Box 1361

City/State/Zip: Coos Bay OR 97420

Phone Number: 541 404 5760

E-Mail Address _____

Organization Represented: _____

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY *Discovery*

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable)_____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: SALE of PARK LAND

Name: JON COOPER

Date: AUG 17 2013 **Meeting Location:** RED LION

Address: 1450 RIVERSIDE

City/State/Zip: BANDON OR 97411

Phone Number: 347 9879

E-Mail Address _____

Organization Represented:_____

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS

Nature HISTORY *Discovery*

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable)_____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Bandon Land Swap Proposal

Name: Rob Taylor

Date: 17-7-2013 **Meeting Location:** Red Lion

Address: PO Box 973

City/State/Zip: Bandon OR

Phone Number: 541-347-9942

E-Mail Address obetewic@msn.com

Organization Represented: myself

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY *Discovery*

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable)_____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: live in area across from project - have concerns

Name: Don Chance

Date:_____ **Meeting Location:**_____

Address:_____

City/State/Zip:_____

Phone Number: 541-297-2647

E-Mail Address _____

Organization Represented:_____

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature
HISTORY
Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable)_____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: BANDON

Name: Dwight Caswell

Date:_____ **Meeting Location:**_____

Address: 457 Alameda Ave.

City/State/Zip: Astoria OR 97103

Phone Number: 503-883-3097

E-Mail Address dwight@vonscom

Organization Represented:_____

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable)_____

Do you wish to make a statement?

☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Land trade, Bandon

Name: Cam Parry

Date:_____ **Meeting Location:** Coos Bay

Address: P.O. Box 5924

City/State/Zip: Charleston, OR 97420

Phone Number: 541-888-1029

E-Mail Address camparry@frontier.com

Organization Represented: My Self, Coos County Resident

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature HISTORY Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) 6(b) - Bandon Biota Land Exchange

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: I'm speaking for Mike Keiser, proponent of the land exchange

Name: Steve Corey

Date: 7/17/13 **Meeting Location:** Coos Bay

Address: P.O. Box 218

City/State/Zip: Pendleton, Oregon 97801

Phone Number: 541-276-3331

E-Mail Address corey@corey-byler.com

Organization Represented: Attorney for Bandon Biota

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS

Nature
HISTORY
Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) 6 b

Do you wish to make a statement?

☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: BANDON LINKS GOLF COURSE

Name: JIM SEELEY

Date: 7/17/13 **Meeting Location:** COOS BAY

Address: 667 MADISON AVE S.E.

City/State/Zip: BANDON

Phone Number: 541 347 8842 847 609 2418 (c)

E-Mail Address jseeley@wildriverscoastalliance.com

Organization Represented: WRCA & BANDON BIOTA

Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission

PUBLIC COMMENT

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

OREGON STATE PARKS
Nature
HISTORY
Discovery

Registration is optional; however, the Commission would welcome the opportunity to keep a record of those in attendance at this meeting, and would appreciate your indication in advance of any subject about which you may wish to make a statement.

Agenda Item Number (if applicable) 6a

Do you wish to make a statement?

☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please specify subject: Bandon

Name: Bill Sweet

Date: 7/17/13 **Meeting Location:** Coos Bay

Address:

City/State/Zip:

Phone Number:

E-Mail Address

Organization Represented: