



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Oregon State Office

P.O. Box 2965

Portland, Oregon 97208



In Reply Refer to:
9017 (OR-932) P

August 6, 2008

EMS TRANSMISSION 08/07/2008
Information Bulletin No. OR-2008-090

To: District Managers: Burns, Coos Bay , Eugene, Lakeview, Medford, Prineville,
Roseburg, and Vale

From: Deputy State Director for Resource Planning, Use and Protection

Subject: EIS Date Request Coming in September

Thank you for your involvement in the July Public Scoping meetings for the *Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides in Oregon* Environmental Impact Statement (Vegetation Treatments EIS). We received valuable input from employees and approximately 40 public citizens during these meetings. That input will help define the scope of the analysis and the issues and alternatives to be considered. The EIS team was pleased with the district presentations, as they helped present the issues and objectives in a very positive way.

Data Request in September

On or about September 8, 2008, you will be receiving a data request from the EIS team lead. Data from the districts is critical to describe the actions expected to take place under each of the EIS alternatives. The planning process steps relevant to this request are as follows:

July – Public scoping.

August – Compile scoping comments into a report with recommendations for alternatives and issues; district managers, RACs and others weigh in on those recommendations; and by August 29, the Oregon/Washington State Director is expected to select the proposed action, alternatives, and issues to be included in the analysis.

September 8-26 – Query districts regarding the probable nature of their integrated vegetation management program under each of the alternatives.

October – Effects writers (technical specialists) address environmental effects of the alternatives using, in part, the information supplied by the districts and compiled into a description of the expected program statewide.

We expect to have 3 to 5 alternatives including the proposed action and the no-action alternative. Much of the data you supplied to the team in December 2007 would likely apply to those alternatives, but that information is not sufficient for the analysis because it does not specifically address the other (expected) alternatives. Although the data request is not finalized, information we will need about each alternative will include your best estimate of how many acres each district expects to treat annually (10-year average) with each treatment method (manual, mechanical, biological, chemical, etc). The team will also need your best estimates for which herbicide active ingredients would be used on each target species, how close to water those would be applied, and on what registered land type the herbicide would be applied (rangeland, forestland, riparian/aquatic, ROW, recreation/administrative). We will also ask for a description of probable uses to achieve fuels management or landscape health objectives.

We ask that you involve your road maintenance, lands, range, forestry, wildlife, botany and other staffs as needed to identify all probable uses. We will define what we mean by “probable,” provide budget assumptions, clarify terms used in the descriptions of the alternatives, and so forth.

Success and Failure Examples

Many district weed coordinators will also be contacted in August and September for assistance in developing examples of the results of treating or not treating noxious and invasive plants. Although much general material has been published about the costs and losses caused by invasive species, and we have various legal and other direction to combat noxious and invasive plants, we wish to provide specific wildland examples pertinent to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) management objectives in Oregon. The value or acres affected can be difficult to quantify sufficiently to display a significant difference between alternatives, and these examples could help display the relative value of doing various levels of invasive and noxious weed control.

A discussion of the need for these examples, and identification of several candidates, was a part of the team/district staff meetings that took place during the day of the public scoping meetings. The team expects examples to run no longer than a page, with any supporting documentation placed in an appendix.

Unfortunately, the data request will come at the end of the fiscal year. Recognizing that the timing may be inconvenient, this Information Bulletin is being sent to give you as much lead time as possible. The timing of this data request will allow the effects writers to complete their work before the holidays and finalize the Draft EIS during December. Your participation is important, and the more you can analyze the impacts to your programs, the more the EIS will benefit your district. If you desire assistance in preparing information in support of this request, please contact Todd Thompson, Restoration Coordinator, at (503) 808-6326.

Districts with Unions are reminded to notify their unions of this Information Bulletin and satisfy any bargaining obligations before implementation. Your servicing Human Resources Office or Labor Relations Specialist can provide you assistance in this matter.

Signed by:
Michael S. Mottice
Deputy State Director for
Resource Planning, Use and Protection

Authenticated by:
Paj Shua Cha
Records Section

Distribution

OR-014 (Molly Boyter)

OR-015 (Erin McConnell)

OR-025 (Lesley Richman)

OR-030 (Dave Henderson, Lynne F Silva, Mike Woods)

OR-054 (Dan Tippy)

OR-080 (Claire Hibler)

OR-096 (Nancy Sawtelle)

OR-104 (Susan Carter)

OR-110 (Mark Mousseaux)

OR-120 (Glenn Harkleroad, Mark E Johnson)

OR-912 (Maya Fuller)

OR-932 (Christi Denton, Ken Denton, Brenda Lincoln, Jeanne Standley, Eric Stone,
Todd Thompson, Miles Brown)

WO-220 (Gina Ramos)