

Resource Management Plans for Western Oregon

Scoping Report

December 2012

*A summary of comments submitted to the BLM during
the formal scoping period, March 9, 2012 - October 5, 2012*



Introduction

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has initiated a revision of six Resource Management Plans (RMPs) in western Oregon. The revisions to the existing RMPs will provide goals, objectives and direction for the management of approximately 2.5 million acres of BLM-administered lands.

Background

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, the BLM Oregon State Office intends to revise the existing 1995 RMPs for the Coos Bay District, Eugene District, Medford District, Roseburg District, Salem District, and the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District. The planning area for the RMPs includes approximately 2.5 million acres of BLM-administered lands and 69,000 acres of split-estate where the BLM only manages the Federal mineral estate. The vast majority of the BLM-administered lands in the planning area are Revested Oregon and California Railroad (O&C) lands, or Reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road (CBWR) lands, and are managed under the statutory authority of the Oregon and California Revested Railroad Lands Act of 1937 (O&C Act, Pub. L. 75-405) and FLPMA (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

The BLM had completed an RMP revision effort for the western Oregon districts in 2008, but the U.S. District Court, District of Oregon, vacated those 2008 RMPs and reinstated the 1995 RMPs.

Why the Resource Management Plans are Being Revised

The BLM periodically evaluates existing RMPs to determine if the plan decisions are still valid. The BLM completed the most recent plan evaluations in 2012. The evaluations showed that the RMPs are in need of updating. Changes are particularly needed for the timber and wildlife programs, and minor changes are needed for most other programs. A plan revision is an appropriate mechanism for the BLM to comprehensively review the mix of resource uses and protections and adjust RMP objectives and associated land use allocations and management direction as needed.

The plan evaluations found that timber sales associated with the lands allocated to sustained yield timber production have continued to depart substantially from the assumptions of the 1995 RMP determinations of the Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ). The reduced levels of regeneration harvest sales and acceleration of thinning from the harvest land base has been a long-term trend since 1999. Accelerated rates of thinning without replenishment of younger forest stands through regeneration harvest means that opportunities for thinning will eventually be exhausted. The current approach to a forest management regime that deviates so considerably from the RMP assumptions used in determination of the ASQ is not sustainable at the declared ASQ level.

There is new information and changed circumstances relevant to management direction and land use allocations for the northern spotted owl. The new Recovery Plan for the northern spotted owl was completed in 2011 and includes recovery actions not addressed in the 1995 RMPs. Designated critical habitat for the northern spotted owl does not align with land use allocations in the 1995 RMPs. There are new listings, recovery plans (or draft recovery plans), and designations of critical habitat for many other fish, plant, and terrestrial species.

The plan evaluations also noted that there is some new information, analysis, policies, and practices for most resource management programs.

Planning Process

The BLM planning process includes various steps from project initiation to completion of the plan as documented in an RMP and authorized by a Record of Decision (ROD):

1. Prepare an internal Preparation Plan
2. Publish a notice of intent in the Federal Register to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS)
3. Conduct scoping and document results in a scoping report
4. Analyze the Management Situation and develop Planning Criteria
5. Formulate alternatives
6. Analyze effects of alternatives
7. Select a preferred alternative
8. Prepare a Draft RMP/Draft EIS
 - A. Publish a notice of availability and provide a 90-day comment period
9. Prepare a Proposed RMP/Final EIS
 - A. Publish notice of availability and provide 30-day protest period
10. Provide a 60-day Governor's Consistency Review
11. Prepare a ROD and approved RMP.

This report serves to document the results of the scoping process listed in the third point above. Subsequent steps of the process will utilize the input received during this phase to provide continuity.

Formal Public Scoping

Scoping is “the process by which the BLM solicits internal and external input on the issues, impacts, and potential alternatives that will be addressed in an EIS” (BLM National Environmental Policy Act Handbook). Scoping is “... an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action” (40 CFR 1501.7).

Summary of the Scoping Process

Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS

The March 9, 2012 Notice of Intent (NOI) initiated the public scoping process for the RMP and associated EIS. This Scoping Report is designed to provide a summary of the responses the public made to points raised in the NOI.

Public Meetings - The BLM held public meetings in Medford, Grants Pass, Roseburg, Klamath Falls, Salem, Coos Bay, Eugene, and Portland. At each of these meetings, the BLM provided a brief overview of the planning process and a list of questions to prompt feedback, and then opened the meeting for discussion. At the public meetings, the BLM did not take formal oral comments but encouraged the public to submit written comments through a variety of venues. The BLM provided brief summaries of the meetings typically including the number of people attending, a list of the key topics raised by the public, and the number of written comments submitted at the meetings. An abbreviated compilation of these meeting summaries (June 2012) is provided in Appendix A - RMPs for Western Oregon Scoping Meeting Summaries.

Scoping Comment Submittal – The BLM solicited public comments and accepted responses via hard copy, e-mail, or facsimile, and set up a comment form on-line. The BLM specifically requested that comments on Areas of Critical Environmental Concern be submitted by June 7, 2012. The BLM requested that comments on issues, planning criteria, and other management guidance be submitted by July 5, 2012.

During the public scoping phase, the BLM also initiated a Lessons Learned process and instituted a Cooperating Agency process following the *Desk Guide to Cooperating Agency Relationships and Coordination with Intergovernmental Partners*. Between June and September 2012, the BLM was going through the Lessons Learned process and establishing the Cooperating Agency process. As a result, the BLM continued to accept any public comments for an additional 90 days until October 5, 2012.

By October 5, 2012, the BLM had received 584 comment letters, with 10 of those being exact duplicates of another previously received comment. Typically, this was because letters were sent via two methods, (i.e., e-mail and postal mail). Almost 90 percent of the comment letters were submitted via e-mail, and approximately 45 percent of all responses were “form letters” (the content was the same as another letter sent by a different person). One letter (received twice) had a petition attached that had approximately 1,500 signatures.

Results of Scoping

A content analysis or detailed review of public scoping responses was completed to categorize the nature of the comments that BLM received. The BLM identified 25 comment categories or primary topic area, each with numerous subcategories. The tables in Appendix B summarize the categorization of comment topics. Approximately 73 percent of the comments addressed how the BLM should manage the planning area and approximately 27 percent of the comments addressed how the BLM should conduct the planning process.

Comments suggested the type and level of detail of analysis, outreach, or collaboration with community groups, and the public’s interest in participating in some form of alternative development. Although the comments covered a broad spectrum of resources that the BLM manages, the three most common were timber management, recreation, and socioeconomic conditions, collectively accounting for almost 60 percent of the individual comments. Timber management related comments, especially maintaining Old Growth/Late Successional Forests and suggesting the use of ecological forestry/restoration practices, were the most raised topics. Recreation uses, especially off-highway vehicles and non-motorized uses of trails, accounted for the next highest percentage of comments. Strong interest was also expressed in the current socioeconomic situation and the effect of BLM management on socioeconomic conditions and jobs.

Most comments were substantially similar to the comments received during the scoping period for the 2008 RMP revision. Those comments were summarized in the February 2006 Western Oregon Plan Revisions Scoping Report.

Public Responses to the Notice of Intent

Issues

Original Issues Identified - The March 9, 2012 Notice of Intent stated, “The first step in this process is formal public scoping which will help identify planning issues and provide an opportunity to receive public comment on the scope of planning, and proposed planning criteria.”

“Planning issues are disputes or controversies about existing and potential land and resource allocations, levels of resource use, production, and related management practices. Issues include resource use, development, and protection opportunities for consideration in the preparation of RMPs. These issues may stem from new information or changed circumstances and the need to reassess the appropriate mix of allowable uses. Planning issues will be addressed in the alternatives set forth in the RMP/EIS.”

The preliminary planning issues identified in the NOI were:

- Vegetation - How should BLM-administered lands be managed, both temporally and spatially, to provide a sustainable supply of wood and other forest products that contribute to the economic stability of communities?
- Habitat - How should BLM-administered lands be managed to contribute to the recovery of threatened and endangered species and provide for other rare and little known late- successional associated species?
- Watershed management and water quality - How should BLM-administered lands be managed to contribute to restoring and maintaining the chemical physical and biological integrity of the Nation's waters, as well as to a safe drinking water supply?
- Wildland fire and fuels - How should BLM-administered lands be managed to reduce the risk of wildfires to communities and integrate fire back into the ecosystem?
- Economics and Community Support - How should BLM-administered lands be managed to contribute to local economies?
- Off-highway vehicle management and public access - How should BLM-administered lands be managed to meet the demand for off-highway vehicle use while protecting other resources and recreation uses? How should transportation networks to and across BLM-administered land be evaluated?

Two additional issues were identified by the BLM subsequent to preparing the list for the NOI:

- Wilderness Characteristics – Which BLM-administered lands should be managed to protect existing wilderness characteristics?
- Coquille Forest Management — Recognizing the unique relationship between management of Federal lands adjacent or nearby the Coquille Forest and how the Coquille Tribe must manage their lands, how should BLM-administered lands be managed in providing for the needs of the Coquille Indian Tribe while ensuring compatibility with the resource management of other non-adjacent BLM-administered lands in the planning area?

Public Comments in General

Many of the comments identified in the public's responses fell within the list of preliminary issues described above. However, there were many more issues not included in the above list of topics that the public suggested should be included in the analysis. These related to recreation, terrestrial species and habitat including old growth, wildland fire and fuels, special areas, aquatic species and habitat, climate change, other botanical species, geology, minerals and energy, lands and land tenure, rangeland management, wild horses, air quality, cultural (historic/prehistoric) resources, and traditional use.

The comments categorized into the above topics along with public comments on the BLM's planning process will be evaluated to determine if they are appropriate Planning Issues to be analyzed in this process. The BLM will determine a final list of issues to be addressed in the RMP revisions. The public comments will be used to help define the scope of the analysis and will help form the basis for development of alternatives.

Public Comments on Scale of Analysis

The NOI stated, "The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Oregon State Office, Portland, Oregon, intends to revise six Resource Management Plans (RMPs) with a single associated Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Western Oregon Planning Area. Although this document identifies the scale of planning as six RMPs with a single EIS, public input is being sought on whether a different approach to scale—such as by district, region, or type of forest—should be considered." While over 60 individual comments responded to this topic, most were duplicative. The following statements capture the range of comments received:

- “One EIS is better than many. Work toward one unified RMP, matched one-to-one with the corresponding EIS, rather than six smaller plans. The new plan should be large scale, whole western Oregon region and EIS with district plans and EISs for aspects that are unique to each district.”
- “Recognize the difference between the different districts and the abilities of these areas to grow commercial timber at sustainable rates. Don’t create a blanket plan applicable to the Willamette Valley, Roseburg area, Rogue Valley area, and the Klamath Falls area...” [this] is ignoring the role climate plays over this mostly mountainous region.”
- “The appropriate scale of the plan should be at the district level. The appropriate scope should cover all proposed, possible, and potential management options and activities available to the BLM.”
- “The scale of analysis should be watershed based and include ALL lands, not just Federal lands. The BLM can accurately tell what occurs on non-Federal lands by using Google Earth.”
- “A broad scope and scale should be recognized in the plan where all BLM-administered lands in the state are included. The plan should consist of two parts—one dealing with moist and one dealing with dry forests.”

Public Comments on Management Questions and Concerns

The NOI stated, “The public is also encouraged to help identify any management questions and concerns that should be addressed in the plan. The BLM will work collaboratively with interested parties to identify the management decisions that are best suited to local, regional, and national needs and concerns.” Almost every comment in some way referred to BLM’s management of resources, but no comments were identified that specifically and explicitly addressed management questions, management concerns, or management decisions.

Public Comments on ACECs

The NOI stated, “As part of this RMP process, the BLM will analyze areas for potential designation as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) in accordance with 43 CFR 1610.7–2. Public nominations for potential ACECs to be considered in these revisions must be made by June 7, 2012.” Comments about Areas of Critical Environmental Concern included keeping the existing ACECs, designating new ACECs and suggestions about management direction for ACECs. Some comments questioned the evaluation of ACEC nominations during the 2008 RMP revision process. Some comments asserted that ACEC designations should not be allowed to conflict with sustained yield timber production.

ACEC “nominations” or comments about areas needing special management were made for the following specific areas:

Beatty Creek, Wilhoit Springs, Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail, Illinois Valley Special Use Botanical Area, Waldo-Takilma, Wild Ginger, Phacelia verna Reserve, Magic Forest, Bunker Hill Headwaters Reserve, Estill, Lower Scappoose Eagle Reserve, The Devil's Staircase, Low-elevation Headwaters of the McKenzie River, Alsea Falls Area, South Roman Nose, Callahan Ridge, Robinson Gulch, Whiskey Creek, Dakubetede Wildland, and French Flat.

The BLM will address the above comments and areas as well as others identified during this planning process in the plan revisions related to special area management.

Public Comments on Preliminary Planning Criteria

The NOI stated, “BLM has also identified preliminary planning criteria to guide the development of the RMPs. These criteria may be modified or other criteria identified after the public scoping process. The public has been invited to comment on the following preliminary planning criteria:”

- Lands addressed in the RMP will be public lands (including split estate lands) administered by the BLM;
- The BLM will protect resources in accordance with FLPMA and other applicable laws and regulations;
- The BLM will examine options for the scope and scale of the plan revisions for the six western Oregon districts including, but not limited to, a singular RMP, district-by-district RMPs, or wet versus dry forests RMPs;
- The BLM will consider and coordinate land use plan decisions to be consistent with existing plans and policies of local, state, Federal, and tribal agencies to the extent those plans and policies are consistent with the purposes, policies, and programs of Federal laws and regulations;
- The BLM will consider applicable recovery actions contained in the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and NOAA Fisheries Service recovery plans and will also consider critical habitat for threatened and endangered species;
- The BLM will consider how to manage BLM-administered lands that contain wilderness characteristics;
- Where existing planning decisions are still valid, those decisions may remain unchanged and incorporated into the new RMP;
- The plans will recognize valid existing rights;
- The BLM will consider withholding lands with important resource values and/or significant levels of investment from mineral leasing and withdrawing lands from mineral location
- Native American tribal consultations will be conducted in accordance with policy, and tribal concerns will be given due consideration. The planning process will include the consideration of any impacts on Indian trust assets;
- Alternatives will be designed to meet the purpose and need for the plan, resolve planning issues, and comply with existing laws.

Two specific comments were made relating to two of the Planning Criteria above:

- “PLF [Public Lands Foundation] notes that the BLM published schedule shows the Formulation of Alternatives will be completed in October 2012. This is before the proposed Critical Habitat is finalized. The PLF is concerned that the published schedule does not include Planning Criteria required by 43 CFR 1610.4-2 (which also includes public comment) or Analysis of the Management Situation required by 43 CFR 1610.4-4. Missing these steps could lead to likely loss in a court challenge under the Administrative Procedures Act. The PLF recommends that the schedule be changed to include the Analysis of the Management Situation and the development of Planning Criteria before formulation of alternatives begins. These documents can be used to provide the necessary focus as well as a clear Purpose and Need for the Revisions. Finalizing the alternatives should not be completed until the Critical Habitat has been fully incorporated.”
- “We are also very concerned that your current schedule calls for immediately developing RMP alternatives without first determining the purpose and need for the plan revisions. Prior to developing alternatives, the BLM must determine the boundaries (based on law) for making land use decisions. The published schedule does not include the development of two required documents that are used to formulate the purpose and need for plans. An Analysis of the Management Situation is required by 43 CFR 1610.4.4 and a statement of the Planning Criteria is required by 43 CFR 1610.4-2 prior to developing alternatives.”

Cooperating Agencies

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations address the mandate that Federal agencies responsible for preparing NEPA analyses and documentation do so "in cooperation with State and local governments" and other agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise (42 U.S.C. §§ 4331(a), 4332(2)). The benefits of enhanced cooperating agency participation in the preparation of NEPA

analyses include: disclosing relevant information early in the analytical process, applying available technical expertise and staff support, avoiding duplication with other Federal, State, Tribal and local procedures and establishing a mechanism for addressing intergovernmental issues. Other benefits include fostering intra- and intergovernmental trust (e.g., partnerships at the community level) and a common understanding and appreciation for various governmental roles in the NEPA process.

In June 2012, the BLM began to identify Federal, State, Tribal, and local government agencies that have jurisdiction by law and special expertise with respect to significant environmental, social, or economic impacts associated with the plan revision. Following the *Desk Guide to Cooperating Agency Relationships and Coordination with Intergovernmental Partners*, the BLM began to engage officials and staff of these other agencies to share skills and resources to help shape the BLM land use plans and environmental analyses to better reflect the policies, needs, and conditions of their jurisdictions and the citizens they represent. In addition to the State of Oregon, there are nine Native American Tribes, seven Federal agencies, and eighteen counties plus the Association of O&C Counties that make up a Cooperating Agency Advisory Group.

Internal Scoping and Lessons Learned

The BLM completed internal scoping and assembled lessons learned from the last planning effort to gain additional input on what to include in this analysis and how to complete the planning process.

Internal Scoping

During the 2012 scoping period, the BLM held internal scoping meetings at all six representative District offices. Employees were asked a series of open-ended questions similar to those offered to the public. Discussion points noted by employees were collected at five of the meetings.

The employee comments were focused more on the process of planning rather than content, including:

- Improving the planning process
- Improving the process for communicating/collaborating with the public
- Identifying appropriate data to use for the analysis

Internal comments related to the content of the RMP revision were similar to public scoping comments. Some internal comments were very specific to proposed management direction and standards and guidelines. Specific topics included:

- Vegetation management, including dry forest/high elevation focus
- Wildlife habitat, including proposed and existing critical habitat
- Riparian management
- Recreation management
- Fuels reduction
- Ecosystem focused management

Employees were also provided an opportunity to make on-line comments similar to the opportunity for the public. Only a few on-line comments were provided by BLM employees. The employee comments related to:

- Fulfilling the BLM mission
- Telling BLM's story in the EIS and the primary issues to address the mission
- Using a National Incident Management System team for the planning and possibly engaging a Virtual Operations Support Team to watch social media
- Using Norm Johnson and Jerry Franklin's idea of designating reserves that can shift based on

- changing environmental conditions
- Developing alternative management for the Willamette Valley fringe with its historic fire-maintained vegetation types
- Providing healthy ecosystems, manage for an ecosystem that is sustainable, and produce timber in sustainable quantities as a byproduct of ecosystem management
- Using Local Objective Based Planning
- Identifying goals for resilient and diverse ecosystems and public access and resource use
- Forgoing unnecessary sideboards and giving local managers and resource specialists control over how to go about managing their areas
- Analyzing by subwatersheds (6th field watersheds), but looking at the surrounding landscape as well, to improve and maintain healthy ecosystems
- Avoiding restrictive planning documents – keeping direction broad

Lessons Learned

In order to establish an effective planning process and address concerns for prior planning efforts, the BLM had invited comments on the 2008 RMP revision, which is summarized in a September 2012 Lessons Learned report. That report includes Lessons Learned from the 2005-2008 Western Oregon Plan Revisions and Initial Scoping Comment Themes of the 2012 Resource Management Plans for Western Oregon (as of 8/15/2012), and is available at: <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/documents.php>. That document lists common themes, issues, and process improvements that were identified through employee, public, task force, and organization reports and interviews.

Alternatives Suggested

The NOI stated, “The purpose of the public scoping process is to determine the scope of issues to be addressed by the environmental analysis, including alternatives, and the significant issues related to the planning process.” The specific alternatives suggested in scoping letters are included below with a brief summary of key points.

Community Based Alternative – Generic

- Develop a community-based alternative that involves protection and restoration of salmon and streams. Work with communities to create forest management, fire mitigation, and recreation opportunities. Shift BLM efforts to restore our forests and watersheds. Protect our remaining old growth forest. Limit OHV [off-highway vehicle] damage to public lands.

Community Conservation Alternative

- Adopt the Community-Conservation alternative that includes: protect all remaining mature and old-growth forests on BLM-administered land; shift BLM efforts to ecological restoration of forests and watersheds; achieve social and economic objectives through forest restoration activities; work with communities to develop forest management and recreation projects; maintain and restore clean water and strong salmon runs that come from these forested watersheds; advance economic goals by encouraging the careful thinning of plantations and fire prone forests which will produce both timber and restore forest health; advance the broadest social goals by pursuing job creation through restoring watersheds; provide timber in an ecological manner; and embrace recreation-based tourism.

Natural Selection Alternative

- The Natural Selection Alternative gives consideration to the economic benefits to the community, broadens the definition of “forest products,” and increases the scope of forest dependent industries.

Forest Management Scheme

- Manage Federal forests for long rotations—300 years in Oregon's Coast Range Douglas-fir forests and 150 years for other stands; intensively managed for the first 100 years including plant, spray, precommercial thin, commercially thin, etc.; have early seral forests with flora and fauna that use young forest; produce a dependable supply of raw materials; keep a stable workforce and a stable source of tax revenue; then walk away for the next 50 years, let the forest grow into old-growth. With this scheme, at some point in time, about half of the Federal forests would be old-growth.

Northwest Forest Plan with Adaptive Management

- Analyze continued management under the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP) as an alternative. NWFP monitoring strongly confirms that the Plan is an effective strategy to continue cutting timber while conserving rivers, fish, and wildlife. The new plan should be based on the 1995 NWFP and be updated where new science shows need for improvements; strengthen and improve the comprehensive, integrated NWFP; restore and conserve ecological structures, functions, and processes; retain and conserve the Late Successional Reserve network; retain and conserve riparian reserves to benefit both terrestrial and aquatic ecology; strengthen connections between reserves to facilitate genetic exchange, resiliency and climate adaptation; retain the Survey and Manage program to conserve rare and uncommon species that continue to suffer from the cumulative effects of past practices such as loss and fragmentation of old forest habitat, adverse interactions between roads and hydrology, fire suppression, post-fire salvage, etc.

Ecological Forestry

- Apply the dry forest management approach espoused by Drs. Jerry Franklin and Norm Johnson, as well as others; support the overarching objectives of promoting tree and understory species diversity; increase structural complexity; and facilitate the development of large structures in young stands. Include a requirement that riparian management be tailored by forest type and consistent with confirmed potential natural vegetation targets utilized in Total maximum Daily Loads and the anti-degradation provisions of the Clean Water Act.

2008 RMPs

- The 2008 Western Oregon Plan Revision was scientifically sound work that appropriately addressed stand volume of 50 billion feet in 1988 growing to 74 billion feet today.

O&C Act

- Analyze an alternative in which no lands are reserved from timber harvesting to meet the intent of the O&C Act.

O&C Trust, Conservation & Jobs Act

- Include a reference alternative in the EIS disclosing and comparing the adverse ecological and economic effects of widespread clearcutting called for in the DeFazio/Walden/Schrader legislation known as the O&C Trust, Conservation & Jobs Act (OCTCJA).

Williams Watershed Community Alternative

- “The Williams Watershed Community Alternative will be based on preservation and promotion of old growth forest, water and salmon conservation, transportation management, including roads and off-road vehicles, cumulative affects with private and BLM lands management, Port Orford cedar management, wildlife and plants, with a focus on threatened and endangered species, local stewardship contracts, and fuels management.”

Appendix A - RMPs for Western Oregon Scoping Meeting Summaries (June 2012)

Medford District

Date and Location: May 16, 2012; Medford, OR

Attendance: 43

Summary: Attendees included representatives from The Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Center; Motorcycle Riders Association; Horse Riders; Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife; Boise-Cascade; Congressman Walden's staffer, Rob Patridge and U.S. Senator Merkley's staffer, Amy Amrhein; and Jackson County Commissioner Don Skundrick.

Issues Raised: Some urged the BLM not to consider turning over BLM-administered lands to the Forest Service or selling it off. Transportation management, with an emphasis on trails, came up from both the OHV users and hikers/horse riders.

Medford District

Date and Location: May 17, 2012; Grants Pass, OR

Attendance: 22

Summary: Attendees included Congressman Walden's staffer, Rob Patridge, and U.S. Senator Merkley's staffer, Amy Amrhein. There were no official representatives from Josephine County. The BLM received three written comments at the meeting.

Issues Raised: Difficulties of managing the checkerboard; economics and the "real costs" associated with timber production; too much emphasis on northern spotted owl and not enough on Southern Oregon/Northern California coho; request for consideration of more OHV trails systems throughout the District; less wilderness with more logging and mining; and questions associated with addressing ongoing litigation.

Lakeview District

Date and Location: May 23, 2012; Klamath Falls, OR

Attendance: 24

Summary: 21 people signed in at the meeting. Attendees included Klamath County Commissioner. The BLM received six written comments at the meeting.

Issues Raised: Studies of suckers; status of a draft proposal; communication with the public; travel management; and project timelines.

Salem District

Date and Location: May 24, 2012; Salem, OR

Attendance: 24

Issues Raised: Travel Management Planning and Visual Resource inventory processes; representatives from several users groups (OHV, equestrian, mountain trail bikes) expressed frustration with the U.S. Forest Service model of travel management planning and urged the BLM to engage in a more collaborative process. One attendee expressed concern over BLM riparian management in the headwaters of the Scappoose watershed. One attendee asked about the proposed spotted owl critical habitat.

Eugene District

Date and Location: May 29, 2012; Springfield, OR

Attendance: 40

Summary: Attendees included representatives from Umpqua Watersheds, Cascadia Wildlands, Association of Forest Service Employees for Ethics, Association of O&C Counties, Lane County Board of Commissioners, a local Tea Party group, Backcountry Horsemen, and Emerald Trailriders Association. Also present were staff members for Congressman DeFazio and U.S. Senator Merkley.

Issues Raised: Conservation organizations indicated that they would like for BLM to stop ‘treating timber as a resource,’ to manage more actively for wildlife, and to increase the size of stream buffers. The recreation advocacy groups want a larger focus on recreation, including more bike and OHV trails, and the equine groups want more horse trails. The Constitutionalist groups would like to see Federal lands turned over to the State or privatized; their second preference would be for the BLM to increase logging to meet the State’s output.

Coos Bay District

Date and Location: May 30, 2012; Coos Bay, OR

Attendance: 26

Issues Raised: Timber versus wildlife management; a majority of the attendees requested that a larger proportion of the land base be managed for timber production and harvest; and that the BLM should harvest older trees (> 80 years old). Several attendees also mentioned that BLM should sell trees based on market conditions. Some attendees voiced the importance of keeping access to BLM-lands and the road network open to the public and asked for more transparent information on road closures (outside the NEPA process). Some attendees expressed concern that the BLM would undertake travel management plans similar to adjacent National Forests that would result in additional, closed access. The overriding majority of attendees thought the planning was too slow and the planning should stay at the local level (district or county). The attendees expressed frustration that the BLM says it understands the urgency and needs of local communities, but the planning timeline covers four years. If the planning happens at the regional level and/or the Governor is involved, attendees expressed fear that the political process, rather than community needs, will drive the decisions.

Roseburg District

Date and Location: May 31, 2012; Roseburg, OR

Attendance: 24

Summary: Attendees included representatives from Umpqua Watersheds, Cascadia Wildlands and Douglas Forest Protective Association.

Issues Raised: Attendees representing the timber industry expressed displeasure at the lack of interpretation of the O&C Act and the open sideboards. They expressed frustration with being asked to provide input into a new planning effort with the time and energy they expended in providing input during the 2008 RMP revision process. Representatives from environmental groups expressed approval of the open sideboards for the scoping process and the neutral nature of the planning process at this stage.

Appendix B – Table 1. Percent of Content and Process Codes

<u>Content or Resource Related Topics</u>	<u>Total # of Content Comments</u>	<u>Percentage of Content Comments</u>
Timber Management	531	27.37%
Recreation	333	17.16%
Socioeconomics, Local Economies, Costs to Taxpayers	296	15.25%
Terrestrial Species and Habitat	123	6.34%
Watershed and Soils	112	5.77%
Wildfire and Fuels Treatment	102	5.26%
Travel Management, Roads and Access	99	5.10%
Special Areas	71	3.66%
Aquatic Species and Habitat	70	3.61%
Climate Change	64	3.30%
Botany	39	2.01%
Geology, Minerals and Energy	36	1.86%
Misc. or General Comments, Concerns and Concepts about land management	33	1.70%
Lands and Land Tenure	13	0.67%
Rangeland Management / Wild Horses	13	0.67%
Air Quality	4	0.21%
Cultural (Historic / Prehistoric) Resources and Traditional Use	1	0.05%
Total Content Comments	1940	
<u>Planning Process Related Topics</u>	<u>Total # of Process Comments</u>	<u>Percentage of Process Comments</u>
Laws, Policy and Existing Plans	167	23.36%
Process	158	22.10%
Project Analysis / RMP Boundaries	144	20.14%
Government / Management	115	16.08%
Alternatives	83	11.61%
Misc. Suggestions to Change the Plan	24	3.36%
Land Uses or “Allocations”	24	3.36%
Total Process Comments	715	
Total Comments	2655	

Appendix B – Table 2. Percent of Total Comment Codes

<u>All Comment Coding Topics</u>	<u>Total Number</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
Timber Management	531	20.00%
Recreation	333	12.54%
Socio-Economics, Local Economies, Costs to Taxpayers	296	11.15%
Laws, Policy and Existing Plans	167	6.29%
Process	158	5.95%
Project Analysis / RMP Boundaries	144	5.42%
Terrestrial Species and Habitat	123	4.63%
Government / Management	115	4.33%
Watershed and Soils	112	4.22%
Wildfire and Fuels Treatment	102	3.84%
Travel Management, Roads and Access	99	3.73%
Alternatives	83	3.13%
Special Areas	71	2.67%
Aquatic Species and Habitat	70	2.64%
Climate Change	64	2.41%
Botany	39	1.47%
Geology, Minerals and Energy	36	1.36%
General Comments, Concerns and Concepts about land management	33	1.24%
Misc. Suggestions to Change the Plan	24	0.90%
Land Uses or “Allocations”	24	0.90%
Lands and Land Tenure	13	0.49%
Rangeland Management / Wild Horses	13	0.48%
Air Quality	4	0.15%
Cultural (Historic / Prehistoric) Resources and Traditional Use	1	0.04%
	2655	