

Comments Submitted During Pre-Scoping

First Name	Last Name	Organization Name	Notes
Tullia	Upton		Dr. Franklin mentioned dry forest management practices versus moist forest management practices. In relation to harvesting old growth. He said that in dry forests, logging old growth is desirable from an ecological perspective. He then went on to mention that with climate change, moist forests are expected to become drier and that management will then be able to decide if they want to harvest moist forests in similar ways as the dry forests. This, to me, means that timber harvest management will decide whether or not to harvest old growth in moist forests. This is a BAD idea as these old growth trees help the forest to withstand stresses of climate change (ie. old growth increases resilience)
Rocky	McVay		In the Memorandum of Understanding between the Sec. of Interior, Agriculture & Commerce on the BLM Managed O & C lands in Western Oregon Statutory Authorities identified - The Federal land Policy Management Act, The Endangered Species Act and the Nation Forest Management Act, but does not mention the 1937 O & C Act - Why? See FLPM Act at Sec 701(b) Thank you -
Stanley	Vejtasa		Good meeting
Joseph (Pat)	Quinn		I am impressed (again) with Dr Johnson's and Franklin's obvious sincerity. That said, I am concerned that public forest convertability to cash value will supercede social values such as: water storage & quality, soil health; biological, genetic and functional diversity for the present and future citizens. Jay clarified, for me, the rough idea of the pilots on Medford and Coos Bay.
E-mail on file at the Roseburg District Office			1. Having 2 senior, geriatric scientists in charge of a program (or developing it), is not thinking "out of the box". Get younger, progressive-thinking scientists involved, that are not being paid by corporate interests. 2. Who will do the actual timbering or cutting of the trees? How will the bidding be done? Will it be centric or focused on small operations or operators? How will their success be measured and how will the pilot rules & regulations be enforced? (Answered)

Comments Submitted During Pre-Scoping

First Name	Last Name	Organization Name	Notes
Dennis	Morgan		<p>GOOD JOB, THANK YOU.</p> <p>3-2-11 Ideas for Roseburg Secretarial Pilot Project</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. monitoring is a BIG Priority, I would like to see BLM conduct multi-party monitoring. 2. Focus harvesting along Ridge-tops which are mostly considered low quality habitat for Northern Spotted Owls, these areas tend to take longer to return to mature forest and would prolong the Early Serial ecosystem. 3. Ridge-tops would be easier to use Prescribe Burning for weed control and to encourage native plants. 4. Retention areas should not be thinned, but left as undisturbed buffers between harvest areas, since thinning tends to push out Mature Forest Wildlife species which need continuous canopy, like Red Tree-Voles, Flying Squirrels and Northern Spotted Owls. 5. Connectivity should be a high priority, between Trees, Patches, Drainages and Landscapes. 6. Canopy Bridges could be used to connect Retention areas across Fuel-breaks, Access-roads, and harvest areas in Key Habitat areas, these areas could be designated Ariel Water Drop Zones. 7. Log Bridges could be used as connections across open areas, by placing 2 or more logs against each other across at Key Habitat Areas, where Motor-Vehicle traffic is unneeded or unwanted. 8. Critter Culverts could be used to connect Key Habitat drainages across Fuel-breaks and harvest areas, where logs would block access for Fire suppression and Harvesting. 9. Harvest edges could be very rough with Legacy trees at tips of forest having 50% or more open area around them, so they can grow bigger branches yet still be connected to retained forest, these areas would act as lifeboats between young forest and future harvest areas. 10. Ridge-tops harvests could be used as Fuel-breaks. 11. Ridge-top Fuel-breaks could continue down to the Riparian Reserve where it would stop and start over again, RR would be less likely to carry the fire, the fuel break could be a little wider near the RR, considering the value of RR, they could be focus of Ariel Water Drops if necessary. 12. Involved Neighbors, ask them to bunch leave trees in corners where BLM sections meet corner to corner and there is Retention Forest that would be benefited by connectivity. This is only a suggestion to check with the owner next door and see if it could work for both properties. <p>Additional Comment: New harvest up to 40% of stands 40 years old and older/40-acre block until NSO recovered or 40 years. Purpose: Not over cut any one area to leave owl with forage area.</p>
Doug	Heiken		<p>Suggested site selection criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Avoid exacerbating adverse cumulative impacts on: peakflows, road density, spotted owls, water quality (hauling rates, stream crossings), large snag habitat, other sensitive wildlife, landscape age-class diversity, carbon in the atmosphere. -prioritize areas with existing road access, and minimal log hauling concerns -Based on clear objectives, select sites that best accomplish objective with the least ecological harms - e.g. early seral habitat can be obtained by improved management on non federal land or by variable retention skips/gaps in existing young stands (<20 years old), timber volume may be obtained by thinning young stands (<80 years old). -Avoid exacerbating adverse competitive interactions between barred owls, spotted owls. -Has anything changed the NWFP assumptions about regeneration? Regeneration in the matrix was based on an assumption about a stable climate that would allow Late Successional Reserves to recover from past logging and function as anticipated. Climate change adds uncertainty and increases value of existing mature forests. Another assumption related to the barred owl. Late Successional Reserves may not be enough habitat to allow co-existence. More owl habitat may be needed in the matrix.

Comments Submitted During Pre-Scoping

First Name	Last Name	Organization Name	Notes
Tara	Lawrance-Mattis	Up the Creek Ranch	<p>3-16-11 Mr. Carlson, Can you get me a disk with a copy of the 2002 Myrtle Creek Watershed Analysis and Water Quality Plan? At 32 MB, it was too large for me to download from the internet.</p> <p>- While you are at it, I would greatly appreciate it if you could also throw in a digital copy of whatever W/A includes the Mid/upper cow creek area. I'm not sure which W/A has it, probably South Umpqua. Thank you much.</p>
Cindy	Haws	Umpqua Watersheds	<p>What worked: Amount of time for audience questions</p> <p>What didn't: It is not clear what the scientific Biological diversity restoration goals are.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. It appears to be the answer before anything is known about the need in the pilot watershed. 3. Social values are narrowly defined as 2x4 and other lumber. 4. There is an assumption that jobs = Timber companies in Douglas County and also that these jobs would be long term and have a significant positive effect. What evidence is provided? And what has the trend been in industrial jobs due to automation & boom & bust?
Name on File at Roseburg District Office			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There should be some management within NWFP riparian reserves. Do not omit 50% of the land base on an arbitrary line. Some thinning would be appropriate. 2) the process should mimic fire patterns. Typically a fire will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leave some areas untouched 2. Scorch 100% in other areas,. 3. Leave snag patches and, 4. Leave dead wood both standing and down. <p>This can be achieved by modeling ignitions and seeing what would happen. East wind, 20% RH, 87, etc... Make several runs...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Achieve stand complexity and watershed diversity 4) Management should be at a watershed scale. (6th or 5th)
Francis	Eatherington	Cascadia Wildlands	<p>At the meeting tonight we were told "Key Stakeholders" were already interviewed. I am surprised you did not consider Cascadia Wildlands to be a Key Stakeholder. We were not interviewed. We are the only environmental group to provide NEPA comments on virtually ALL Roseburg BLM Projects.</p> <p>Coos Bay BLM has met 150% of their ASQ (ave. over 4 years) - Why a Pilot there?</p> <p>It is hard on our community to have so many pilots here - why not spread them out - give Eugene & Portland people something to do - put the Pilot in Salem or Eugene BLM.</p>
KEN	CARLONI	Umpqua EDU	<p>When budgets get tight, monitoring is always the first to go. How are you going to assure that monitoring will not get cut once the logs are produced?</p>

Comments Submitted During Pre-Scoping

First Name	Last Name	Organization Name	Notes
Dennis	Morgan		Thank You, good start! Please keep all concerns and address how you used them or set them aside. This was missed in recent CP Process. Thanks again - Dennis P.S. BLM should have done 17th workshop 1st - may have helped?
James	Nielsen		Need to set objective for how this Pilot Project fits in with the needs of overall federal forest mgt. How will it affect forest planning process.
Diana	Wales		I still don't know what the scientific goal is, nor what the measurable outcomes - ecological or social - will be?
Buzz	Lang		If this proposed plan does work and hits the mark in all aspects and phases...will it be enforced, or at least strongly recommended, to be put in place on private (corporate) lands not in the matrix? Will there be buy-in and commitment at that level?