


Introduction

The Lake Abert 8-Digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) subbasin is comprised of 660,000 acres in Lake County. Fifty percent of the subbasin is shrubland and rangeland, thirty percent is forestland, and about ten percent is grassland, hayland, and pastureland. Resource concerns include wind and streambank erosion, declining rangeland condition due to past grazing practices, poor or limited irrigation water management on pastureland, and diminishing wildlife habitat. Addressing these concerns is difficult because of land use constraints, such as high soil salinity; unstable economic conditions; and inadequate cost share programs.

There are 30 farms and 49 operators in the subbasin. Many of the farms and ranches are only marginally profitable. Most farmers and ranchers are aware of local resource concerns and appreciate the effect conservation has

on these concerns; however, conservation is not widely perceived to be economically feasible, timely technical assistance is not readily available, and the community is not an effective force behind resource management.

The NRCS Lakeview Service Center, Lakeview and Ft. Rock/Silver Lake Soil and Water Conservation District, and Upper Chewaucan Watershed Council provide conservation assistance in the subbasin.




Profile Contents

- [Introduction](#)
- [Physical Description](#)
- [Land Use Map & Precipitation Map](#)
- [Common Resource Area](#)

- [Resource Concerns](#)
- [Census and Social Data](#)
- [Progress/Status](#)
- [Footnotes/Bibliography](#)


Relief Map



17120006
Ownership Map

Legend

-  PRIVATE
-  PUBLIC
-  TRIBAL
-  UNKNOWN



Physical Description

[Back to Contents](#)

ALL NUMBERS IN THIS PROFILE ARE FOR OREGON ONLY

Land Cover/Land Use (NLCD ²)	Ownership - (2003 Draft BLM Surface Map Set ¹)							
	Public		Private		Tribal		Totals	%
	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%		
Forest	147,800	22%	51,600	8%	0	0%	199,400	30%
Grain Crops	*	---	*	---	0	0%	*	---
Conservation Reserve Program Land ^a	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Grass/Pasture/Hay	24,200	4%	33,100	5%	0	0%	57,300	9%
Orchards/Vineyards	0	0%	*	---	0	0%	*	---
Row Crops	*	---	*	---	0	0%	*	---
Shrub/Rangelands	276,200	42%	51,300	8%	0	0%	327,500	50%
Water/Wetlands/Developed/Barren	42,200	6%	32,200	5%	0	0%	74,600	11%
Oregon HUC Totals ^b	490,600	74%	168,700	26%	0	0%	659,300	100%

*: Less than 1 percent of total acres. See below for special considerations.

a: Estimate from Farm Service Agency records and includes CRP/CREP.

b: Totals are approximate due to rounding and small unknown acreages.

Special Considerations for This 8-Digit HUC:

- Oats occasionally are grown for hay.
- Salinity of the soils generally is too high to grow row crops.

Irrigated Lands (1997 NRI ³ Estimates for Non-Federal Lands Only)	Type of Land	ACRES	% of Irrigated Lands	% of HUC
	Cultivated Cropland	0	0%	0%
	Uncultivated Cropland	27,800	55%	4%
	Pastureland	22,400	45%	3%
	Total Irrigated Lands	50,200	100%	7%



(Continued on the following pages)

17120006
Land use/Land cover Map

[Back to Contents](#)

Legend


-  Shrub/Rangelands
-  Orchard/Vineyards
-  Row Crops
-  Forest
-  Grass/Pasture/Hay Lands
-  Grain Crops
-  Water/Wetlands/Developed/Barren



Common Resource Area Map

[Back to Contents](#)

Only the major units are described below - for descriptions of all units within the HUC, go to: <http://lce.or.nrcs.usda.gov/website/cra/viewer.htm>



6.11 – Cascade Mountains, Eastern Slope - Pumice Plateau Forest:

This unit occurs on the southern extreme of the MLRA and is characterized by nearly level to undulating pumice-mantled plateaus that support dominantly lodgepole pine and ponderosa pine. The soils consist of deep deposits of ash and pumice from Mt. Mazama. Cold temperatures and frost limit the production of ponderosa pine. The temperature regime is cryic, and the moisture regime is xeric.

21.2 – Klamath and Shasta Valleys and Basins - Fremont Pine-Fir Forest:

This unit is characterized by forested mountains and plateaus in the eastern part of the MLRA. The temperature regime generally is frigid but is cryic in the higher areas, and the moisture regime is xeric. The dominant soils are those of the Rogger, Mound, Chocktoot, and Hallihan series. The vegetation is dominantly ponderosa pine and white fir with lodgepole pine in the higher areas.

21.4 – Klamath and Shasta Valleys and Basins - Warm Klamath Juniper Woodland:

This unit is characterized by rangeland on hills and mountains. The temperature regime is mesic, and the moisture regime is xeric. Lorella soils are dominant. The vegetation is dominantly bluebunch wheatgrass and Wyoming big sagebrush with significant amounts of western juniper. Precipitation is about 10 to 16 inches.

23.4 – Malheur High Plateau - High Lava Plains: This unit is on basalt plateaus and the escarpments of fault block mountains. The temperature regime is frigid or mesic, and the moisture regime is primarily aridic. The soils typically are shallow or moderately deep to bedrock or a cemented pan and have a strongly developed argillic horizon. The vegetation is dominantly low sagebrush, Wyoming big sagebrush, Idaho fescue, Thurber needlegrass, and bluebunch wheatgrass. Playas, small intermittent lakes, and clay that has a high shrink-swell potential are common in depressions.

23.6 - Malheur High Plateau - Warm High Desert Basins: This unit is characterized by basins that contain significant amounts of volcanic ash. The temperature regime is dominantly mesic, and the moisture regime is aridic. The soils typically are very deep and are well drained to very poorly drained. Wetland areas, shallow lakes, and playas are locally common.

Physical Description – Continued


[Back to Contents](#)

		ACRES	ACRE-FEET			
Irrigated Adjudicated Water Rights (OWRD ⁴)	Surface	14,913	58,532			
	Well	4,169	12,467			
	Total Irrigated Adjudicated Water Rights	19,082	70,998			
Stream Flow Data	USGS 10384000 CHEWAUCAN RIVER, NEAR PAISLEY, OR	Total Avg. Yield	106,096			
		May – Sept. Yield	52,698			
		MILES	PERCENT			
Stream Data ⁵ <i>*Percent of Total Miles of Streams in HUC</i>	Total Miles – Major (100K Hydro GIS Layer)	552	---			
	303d/TMDL Listed Streams (DEQ)	155	28%			
	Anadromous Fish Presence (StreamNet)	0	0%			
	Bull Trout Presence (StreamNet)	0	0%			
		ACRES	PERCENT			
Land Cover/Use ² Based on a 100-foot stretch on both sides of all streams in the 100K Hydro GIS Layer	Forest	10,605	33%			
	Grain Crops	64	0%			
	Grass/Pasture/Hay	4,574	14%			
	Orchards/Vineyards	0	0%			
	Row Crops	1	0%			
	Shrub/Rangelands – Includes CRP Lands	12,533	40%			
	Water/Wetlands/Developed/Barren	3,903	12%			
	Total Acres of 100-foot Stream Buffers	31,681	---			
Land Capability Class <i>(Croplands & Pasturelands Only)</i> <i>(1997 NRI³ Estimates for Non-Federal Lands Only)</i>	1 – slight limitations	0	0%			
	2 – moderate limitations	0	0%			
	3 – severe limitations	19,000	30%			
	4 – very severe limitations	28,000	44%			
	5 – no erosion hazard, but other limitations	13,700	22%			
	6 – severe limitations; unsuitable for cultivation; limited to pasture, range, forest	2,300	4%			
	7 – very severe limitations; unsuitable for cultivation; limited to grazing, forest, wildlife habitat	0	0%			
	8 – miscellaneous areas; limited to recreation, wildlife habitat, water supply	0	0%			
	Total Croplands & Pasturelands	63,000	---			
Confined Animal Feeding Operations – Oregon CAFO Permit – 12/2004						
Animal Type	Dairy	Feedlot	Poultry	Swine	Mink	Other
No. of Permitted Farms	0	0	0	0	0	0
No. of Permitted Animals	0	0	0	0	0	0

Resource Concerns

[Back to Contents](#)


Tons of Soil Loss by Water Erosion: Due to the limited amount of non-Federal cropland and pastureland within this HUC, no reliable NRI soil loss estimates are available.



- ❖ All listed stream miles exceed State water quality standards for temperature. Elevated stream temperatures may be due to inadequate riparian shade, stream channel widening, warm irrigation return flows, and other anthropogenic or natural causes.
- ❖ Conservation practices that can be used to address these water quality issues include grazing management, irrigation water management, and use of riparian buffers.

Watershed Projects, Plans, Studies, and Assessments			
NRCS Watershed Projects ⁶		NRCS Watershed Plans, Studies, and Assessments ⁷	
Name	Status	Name	Status
None	None	None	None
ODEQ TMDL's ⁸		ODA Agricultural Water Quality Management Plans ⁹	
Name	Status	Name	Status
None	None	Goose & Summer Lakes	Completed
OWEB Watershed Council ¹⁰		Watershed Council Assessments ¹¹	NWPCC Subbasin Plans and Assessments ¹⁸
Upper Chewaucan Watershed Council		None	None

(Continued on page 8)



Map Footnote [417](#)

Resource Concerns - Continued

[Back to Contents](#)

Resource Concerns/Issues by Land Use							
SWAPA +H Concerns	Specific Resource Concern/Issue	Grass\Pasture	Grain Crops	Row Crops	Hay	Shrub/Range	Forest
		Soil Erosion	Wind				X
	Streambank	X				X	X
Soil Condition	Soil Compaction	X					
Water Quantity	Water Management for Irrigated Land	X			X		
Water Quality, Surface	Temperature	X				X	X
Air Quality	Airborne Sediment Causing Safety/Health Problems				X		
Plant Suitability	Site and Intended Use Suitability					X	X
Plant Condition	Productivity, Health, and Vigor	X			X		
Animal Habitat, Domestic	Water - Quantity and Quality					X	
Animal Habitat, Wildlife	Water - Quantity and Quality					X	
Human, Economics	Land Use Constraints/Restrictions	X			X	X	
	High Risk and Uncertainty				X		
	Low or Unreliable Profitability	X			X	X	X
Human, Political	Inadequate Availability of Cost Share Programs	X			X	X	X

Grass/Pasture & Hay

- Most ranches have areas of irrigated hay and pasture.
- Generally, a higher level of irrigation water management is used on hayland than on pastureland.
- Wind erosion can be a concern in areas of sandy soils where the forage has not been properly managed as cover or for maximum production.
- A low economic return limits adoption of appropriate conservation practices.

Shrub/Rangeland

- Some areas of rangeland are dominantly annual grasses and shrubs because of past grazing practices.
- Loss of riparian vegetation contributes to stream warming.
- Low profit limits conservation adoption.

Forestland

- Lack of thinning and forest management can result in stagnate stands that have low value for commercial wood products, livestock grazing, or wildlife habitat.
- Low profit, unreliable markets, and inadequate incentive programs limit forest management activities on private, non-industrial forestland.

General

- The high salinity and content of minerals in the soils limit or restrict many uses.

FEDERALLY LISTED THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES ¹²	
THREATENED SPECIES	CANDIDATE SPECIES
Mammals - Canada lynx	Birds – Yellow-billed cuckoo
Birds – Bald eagle	Amphibians and Reptiles –
Fish – Shortnose sucker, Lost River sucker, Warner sucker, Bull trout, Hutton Springs tui chub, Foskett speckled dace	Columbia spotted frog , Oregon spotted frog
	PROPOSED SPECIES None
ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT¹³ – None	


Census and Social Data^{/14}

[Back to Contents](#)

Number of Farms: 30

Number of Operators: 49

- Full-Time Operators: **21**
- Part-Time Operators: **28**



Estimated Level of Willingness and Ability to Participate in Conservation^{/15}: **Moderate**



Farmers and ranchers in the Lake Abert subbasin reportedly are aware of local resource concerns and the importance of their resource management system in addressing these concerns. Most operators are well educated, maintain a positive stewardship attitude, and have already adopted some conservation practices. The operators, however, perceive conservation to be only moderately agriculturally and economically feasible. Agriculture in the subbasin reportedly is only moderately profitable; therefore, it is unlikely the operators will adopt agricultural innovations, including conservation. Timely technical assistance is not readily available throughout most of the subbasin.

Conservation marketing targeted at meeting the particular needs of the Lake Abert operators and alleviating their concerns could increase the adoption of conservation practices. Also, offering expedient technical and financial assistance could help accelerate the diffusion of conservation throughout the subbasin.

Evaluation of Social Capital^{/16}: **LOW**

Social capital and involvement of the community in promoting conservation among agricultural landowners in the Lake Abert subbasin reportedly is low. Effective local leadership and community participation is not consistent. Possibly because of the geographic remoteness of the subbasin and the small population, communication among neighbors within the community and with sources of information outside the region is weak. Nevertheless, when an issue arises that the people of Lake Abert deem important, volunteers step forward.

Community development assistance and conservation marketing could help the community gain an appreciation for conservation and possibly become a significant force behind the diffusion of conservation among the farmers and ranchers in Lake Abert subbasin.




Progress/Status

[Back to Contents](#)

PRMS Data	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	Avg/Year	Total
Total Conservation Systems Planned (Acres)	487	3,431	230	0	0	830	4,148
Total Conservation Systems Applied (Acres)	0	2,861	955	0	0	763	3,816
Conservation Treatment (Acres)							
Waste Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buffers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Erosion Control	0	432	0	0	0	86	432
Irrigation Water Management	0	218	0	0	0	44	218
Nutrient Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pest Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prescribed Grazing	1,742	1,584	0	0	0	665	3,326
Trees and Shrubs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservation Tillage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wildlife Habitat	0	2,953	0	0	0	591	2,953
Wetlands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Resource Status Cumulative Conservation Application on Private Lands



Estimates are based on information received from local conservationists in the watershed.

- ❖ Progress over the last 5 years has been focused on:
 - ~ Prescribed grazing on irrigated pasture
 - ~ Erosion control
 - ~ Wildlife habitat
- ❖ A high level of conservation management is being applied in most areas of irrigated alfalfa and pasture.
- ❖ Commonly the rangeland is not intensively farmed because of a lack of adequate water and grazing management. A majority of the ranches are operated by absentee landowners or lessees.
- ❖ Most private, industrial forestland meets State forest practice act requirements.
- ❖ High cost and unreliable markets limit forest management activities on private, non-industrial forestland.

Lands Removed from Production through Farm Bill Programs

- ❖ Conservation Reserve Program (CRP): **None**
- ❖ Wetland Restoration Program (WRP): **None**
- ❖ Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP): **None**

Footnotes/Bibliography

[Back to Contents](#)

All data is provided "as is." There are no warranties, express or implied, including the warranty of fitness for a particular purpose, accompanying this document. Use for general planning purposes only.

1. Ownership Layer – Source: The 1:24,000 scale public ownership layer is the land ownership/management for public entities, including Federal, Tribal, State, and local entities. This is a seamless, statewide Oregon Public Ownership vector layer composed of fee ownership of lands by Federal, State, Tribal, county, and city agencies. The layer is comprised of the best available data compiled at 1:24,000 scale or larger, and the line work matches GCDB boundary locations and ORMAP standards where possible. The layer is available from the State of Oregon GIS Service Center: <http://www.gis.state.or.us/data/alphalist.html>. For current ownership status, consult official records at appropriate Federal, State, and county offices. Ownership classes grouped to calculate Federal ownership vs. non-Federal ownership by the Water Resources Planning Team.
2. National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD) - Originator: U.S. Geological Survey (USGS); Publication date: 19990631; Title: Oregon Land Cover Data Set, Edition: 1; Geospatial data presentation form: Raster digital data; Publisher: U.S. Geological Survey, Sioux Falls, SD, USA; Online linkage: <http://edcwww.cr.usgs.gov/programs/lccp/nationallandcover.html>; Abstract: These data can be used in a geographic information system (GIS) for any number of purposes, such as assessing wildlife habitat, water quality, pesticide runoff, land use change, etc. The State data sets are provided with a 300-meter buffer beyond the State border to facilitate combining the State files into larger regions.
3. ESTIMATES FROM THE 1997 NRI DATABASE (REVISED DECEMBER 2000) REPLACE ALL PREVIOUS REPORTS AND ESTIMATES. Comparisons made using data published for the 1982, 1987, or 1992 NRI may produce erroneous results. This is because of changes in statistical estimation protocols and because all data collected prior to 1997 were simultaneously reviewed (edited) as 1997 NRI data were collected. All definitions are available in the glossary. In addition, this December 2000 revision of the 1997 NRI data updates information released in December 1999 and corrects a computer error discovered in March 2000. For more information: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/NRI/>
4. Irrigated Adjudicated Water Rights – Water Rights Information System (WRIS), Oregon Water Resources Department, <http://www.wrd.state.or.us/maps/wrlexport.shtml>
5. StreamNet is a cooperative venture of the Pacific Northwest's fish and wildlife agencies and tribes and is administered by the [Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission](#). StreamNet provided data and data services in support of the region's fish and wildlife program and other efforts to manage and restore the region's aquatic resources. Official StreamNet website: <http://www.streamnet.org/>
6. Natural Resources Conservation Service, Watershed Projects Planned and Authorized, <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/Purpose>.
7. Natural Resources Conservation Service, Watershed Plans, Studies, and Assessments completed, http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/watershed/Surveys_Plng.html#Watershed%20Surveys%20and%20Plan
8. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Total Maximum Daily Loads, <http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/TMDLs/TMDLs.htm>
9. Oregon Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Water Quality Management Plans, http://www.oregon.gov/ODA/NRD/water_agplans.shtml

Footnotes/Bibliography Continued

[Back to Contents](#)

All data is provided "as is." There are no warranties, express or implied, including the warranty of fitness for a particular purpose, accompanying this document. Use for general planning purposes only.

10. Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, <http://oregon.gov/OWEB/WSHEDS/index.shtml>
11. Watershed Assessments completed by local watershed councils following the Oregon Watershed Assessment Manual, http://oregon.gov/OWEB/docs/pubs/ws_assess_manual.shtml.
12. NRCS Field Office Technical Guide, Section II, Threatened and Endangered List.
13. Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, Public Law 94-265. As amended through October 11, 1996.
14. Data were taken from the 2002 Agricultural Census and adjusted by percent of HUC in the county or by percent of zip code area in the HUC, depending on the level of data available. Data were also taken from the U.S. Population Census, 2000.
15. Conservation participation was estimated using NRCS Social Sciences Technical Note 1801, [Guide for Estimating Participation in Conservation](#), 2004. Four categories of indicators were evaluated: Personal characteristics, farm structural characteristics, perceptions of conservation, and community context. Estimates are based on information received from local conservationists in the watershed.
16. Social capital is an indicator of the community's ability and willingness to work together to solve problems. A high amount of social capital helps a community to be physically healthy, socially progressive, and economically vigorous. A low amount of social capital typically results in community conflict, lack of trust and respect, and unsuccessful attempts to solve problems. The evaluation is based on NRCS Technical Report Release 4.1, March, 2002: [Adding Up Social Capital: An Investment in Communities](#). Local conservationists provided information to measure social capital. Scores range from 0 to 76.
17. [Surface and Groundwater Resource Protection Map](#)
 - a. 2002 303d Listed Streams designated by Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and approved by the Environmental Protection Agency, Section 303d Clean Water Act, <http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/303dlist/303dpage.htm>
 - b. Groundwater Management Areas designated by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Revised Statutes – Ground Water ORS 468B.150 to ORS 468B.190, <http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/groundwa/wqgw.htm>
 - c. Groundwater Restricted Areas designated by Oregon Water Resources Commission, Oregon Department of Water Resources, http://egov.oregon.gov/OWRD/PUBS/aquabook_protections.shtml
 - d. The Sole Source Aquifer (SSA) Protection Program is authorized by Section 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-523, 42 U.S.C. 300 et. seq), <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/ssanp.html>
18. Subbasin assessments and plans are developed by local groups (SWCDs, watershed councils, tribes, and others) as part of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's fish and wildlife program in the Columbia River Basin. This program is funded and implemented by the Bonneville Power Administration. <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/subbasinplanning/Default.htm>.