

Report on Community Listening Sessions

For the

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR WESTERN OREGON



Prepared by:

COGAN OWENS COGAN

COGAN
OWENS
COGAN

With assistance from:

DS CONSULTING



Through Oregon Consensus



January 9, 2014

OVERVIEW

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) requested that Oregon Consensus assist the development of BLM’s Resource Management Plans (RMP) for Western Oregon by helping with the design and facilitation of four informal Public Listening Sessions in the December 2013. The goal of these sessions was two-fold:

- 1) Inform the public about where BLM is in the RMP planning process; and, most importantly;
- 2) Provide the public an opportunity to give BLM input in an informal setting on the overall direction of the RMP.

The report that follows presents the public’s input provided to BLM in each of the four listening sessions. In addition, the common themes that Oregon Consensus’ facilitation team heard in the sessions are reported.

Locations, dates, attendance and the number of completed input forms were:

LOCATION	DATE	ATTENDANCE*	COMPLETED INPUT FORMS
CORVALLIS	DECEMBER 3	50	10
MEDFORD	DECEMBER 10	60	21
COOS BAY	DECEMBER 11	34	7
ROSEBURG	DECEMBER 18	40	18
TOTAL		184	56

*Approximate based on sign-in sheets; not all attendees signed in.

Each workshop was approximately three hours in length and facilitated by Cogan Owens Cogan or DS Consulting. In each session, BLM presented background information in a brief plenary session, followed by an opportunity for the public to ask clarifying questions. The presentation included:

- A summary of where BLM is at in its planning process,;
- Purpose and Need
- BLM’s current thinking about four “Key Elements” considered as fundamental building blocks of any alternatives to be assessed:
 - Sustainable Timber;
 - Clean Water and Healthy Fish;
 - Habitat for Owls and other Wildlife; and
 - Old Growth Forests
- When and how the public can stay engaged, including in review of draft Planning Criteria.

This plenary session was followed by smaller groups responding, in an interactive, facilitated format, to three questions. These questions were also asked on an input form for people who wished to put their ideas into writing:

- 1) Are there other options for the Key Elements that BLM should consider?

- 2) What other factors are of great interest to you?
- 3) Do you have any other comments regarding the RMPs for Western Oregon?

The small group sessions were followed by a final plenary session in which the facilitators shared the key ideas from each small group, the local District Manager reported on what she/ he heard as they wandered from small group to small group, and the public was allowed a final opportunity to ask any lingering questions.

At each event, the following materials were provided to attendees:

- Agenda
- Purpose and Need Statement
- Copy of portions of the PowerPoint Presentation; and
- Input Sheet.

The BLM will use the information gathered at the Community Listening Sessions to inform the decisions of the BLM managers and the Interdisciplinary Team members' work. All of the comments and input sheets have been consolidated into this Report on Community Listening Sessions. This report will be sent to the specialists working on the project, the planners, the managers, the BLM western Oregon district staff, and shared with the public. It is an important source of information to guide the BLM on developing the range of alternatives and the planning effort.

COMMON THEMES

While the following themes were not universally agreed upon or unanimously voiced, the following themes were heard in each of the listening sessions by members of the facilitation team:

- Recreation and fire management should be key themes as they address the human element currently missing.
- Old growth should not be considered an equal element as it is not statutorily driven. There was no agreement on what qualifies/should be classified as old growth.
- Economics the fourth leg of the stool. An economic analysis of the key themes is needed that includes the potential added values of recreation and fire suppression.
- Management strategies need to consider adjacent land ownerships and land management programs.
- Given the checkerboard ownership pattern in Western Oregon, portions of BLM land should be managed for specific purposes, rather than trying to manage for multiple purposes on every parcel.
- County and industry representatives in particular stress the need for steady, predictable income through sustainable timber harvest. Others note that equal or greater economic returns may be attainable from use of the forests for recreation/tourism. There is strong interest in having economics modeled, both for timber harvest levels and for value-added uses, such as recreation.
- Forests need to be managed for a diversity of timber species and ages, rather than employing a monoculture approach.

- Stream management needs to be flexible to respond to varying functions and landscapes. Whatever riparian buffers are applied, they need to be adequate to protect water and fish.
- Habitat management strategies need to address more than listed species and need to be coordinated with management of adjacent lands to provide connectivity of habitat.
- Habitat has recreational and scenic values that need to be considered.
- Take advantage of, rather than expanding, the existing road system by maintaining, repairing or decommissioning roads
- The complications/obstacles to public access of adjoining land ownerships need to be addressed.
- There are differing (and often contradictory) opinions about clear-cutting as a timber management strategy.

Other ideas frequently mentioned:

- Clarify meanings with definitions, especially around “old growth” and “sustainable harvest”.
- Provide clear, justifiable and justified science and decisions in the RMPs.
- Factor in the effects of climate change.
- Analysis should include cumulative effects including impacts from private land management.
- Acknowledge BLM’s limitations openly, frankly (such as constraints from the O & C Act, statutory authorities, or other policies).
- Opportunities for local input in RMP implementation, i.e. projects, are desired.
- Seek authority to trade lands to overcome BLM’s checkerboard-lands which are difficult to manage.
- Consider new management designations such as: ‘research’, ‘botanical’, ‘natural’ and ‘primitive’.

OBSERVATIONS

Observations about the Public Listening Session process offered by the facilitation team include:

- Attendees in all locations expressed great appreciation for the opportunity to both hear from BLM and to talk respectfully with each other about what mattered to each of them. In conjunction with this came the message that BLM should convene more of these civil discussions to help bridge the gap between the diverse constituents who all share the common value of caring for public lands.
- The information presented and the length of the plenary session presentation seemed appropriate to the listening session format and purpose. The options for management presented in the presentation created some confusion, however, with some participants not understanding either what they were or whether they were a sampling of a broader array of management actions that BLM would be considering.
- The question of how the RMP process will be affected by proposed Congressional legislation can be expected at any public forum. Listening session attendees seemed satisfied with the response that BLM is in the middle of a planning process that is based on current directives and will be responsive to any new legislative direction should Congress act.
- Similarly, the question of what BLM is doing differently this time (from WOPR) was regularly posed. Public presentations should routinely include a short explanation of how the RMP planning differs and why.

- The absence of technical staff was not a deterrent to discussion. Many listening session participants were, or considered themselves to be, technically conversant in all of the topics. Disagreements with agency representatives on technical aspects of the plan were avoided, allowing for a focus on policy. Ensuring the public that its input will be shared with resource specialists is essential, however.
- The facilitated small group format afforded the opportunity for participants to adequately share their perspectives on the issues that they wished to address; the facilitation team did not hear or sense any frustration about issues not being able to be raised. The format also successfully limited the ability to disrupt, grandstand or otherwise politicize the sessions, although frustrations were expressed about the ability to hear (small room sizes in several locations) and about disrespect from fellow participants (in one listening session).
- In addition to explaining the listening session format to registrants, staff at the registration tables need to be briefed on the “whys” of the format in order to respond to questions about the purpose of the sessions, how and when input will be solicited, etc.

INPUT BY LISTENING SESSION

Input at each listening session is reported in three forms:

- A. Plenary session Questions/Answers
- B. Small work groups by question and group
- C. Input sheets

1. LOCATION: CORVALLIS

Date: December 3, 2013

Attendance: 50

A. Plenary Session Q/A

What are public domain lands? What is the percentage of PDL vs. O&C?

A: PDL are not operated under O&C Lands Act. Percentage will be provided at later date.

How does the RMP process fit with current legislative action being taken by Congressionals? Why go through this whole effort now when it likely may change?

A: BLM’s only current tool is to do an RMP. The current plan is out of date and the last effort to update was unsuccessful. We feel we must take action; especially since Congress may or may not be successful.

How much of the plan will consider the O&C Act of 1937?

A: The plan must meet the O&C Act...and also the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Federal Land Management Policy Act, and the Clean Air Act.

Old growth—are you talking about forests or forest characteristics?

A: We are talking about what is defined in the Purpose and Need which addresses “older, multi-structured coniferous forests”

NEPA requires you to do a scoping process. Are you doing it now? By February 2014? Tonight?

A: BLM did the formal scoping for this process in March of 2012. Tonight is a preview of what are thinking about for our planning criteria. We will be producing a report about these informal discussions and what we hear from you. BLM is trying to talk to you early. This is an informal, not required by NEPA preview and discussion.

With regards to “range of retention”, what is meant by 18-30%?

A: We are referring to the percentage of the trees in the stand that should be left after a sale. For example, if there were 100 trees per acre in a stand, should an average of 18 or 30 trees per acre remain afterwards?

After these meetings and you make your plan, who is the final decision maker?

A: The State Director will confer with the Washington DC Director and the Secretary of Interior, given her interest in this process.

If you did WOPR and failed, for a variety of reasons, what are you doing differently this time?

A: A number of things: First, we have an ESA Agreement in place to ensure effective consultation with USFWS and NOAA; second, this meeting tonight: we are sharing our thinking before it is ‘perfect’ because we want discussion with the public; third, we have more actively involved Cooperating Agencies from the state, counties, tribal and federal governments which is an important part of how we move forward with our plan; and fourth, the Purpose and Need was finished early, as a stand-alone document for the public to see, to give everyone an indication of where BLM is headed with this plan.

How do laws shape the P&N? Could the plan be illegal?

A: No, the RMP that we adopt must comply with applicable federal laws.

Where do economic benefits or thinking fit? Don’t see that except as a side comment under timber in the four key elements. Also, where does recreation fit? What is your logic framework?

A: There are a lot of important issues that are not in our P&N. It is not intended to be the comprehensive list of everything the RMP must do, but instead are the key drivers or needs that must be addressed first and are likely to differ among the alternatives. The four key elements are important aspects of the Purpose and Need that we are ready to talk about at this point in the planning process. The analysis will address the economic effects of each of the alternatives and this information will be given to the decision-makers to help with their selection of a Proposed RMP from the alternatives we include in the draft RMP/EIS.

The P&N drives the alternatives—what is your definition for sustained yield? Would thinning only apply as an alternative or...?

A: Sustained yield is actually in the P&N (showed the group where this was in the packet and moved the group out for small group discussions). Sustained yield is the volume of timber that a forest can produce continuously (i.e., at a non-declining, even flow of timber volume) at a given intensity of management. A “thinning only” alternative would not likely meet the purpose of providing a sustained yield of timber, because the volume of timber produced would decline over time.

B. Small Group Discussions

In this listening session, three small groups were convened. Summary notes are organized by question.

1) Are there other options for the Key Elements that BLM should consider?

Sustainable Timber

Small Group #1

- Ensuring steady income to counties and communities should be common to all alternatives.
- Ensuring steady volume is essential.
- Apply a “least cost” approach to maximize the value of harvest.
- Need to take a landscape level approach that considers neighboring ownerships. How will RMP work with NWFP Reserves?
- Prioritize portions of BLM land for specific purposes; don’t try to accomplish everything on every parcel.
- How to best manage lands on a sustainable basis is the priority; revenue to counties should not be the driver.
- Recognize the contribution of private lands and different practices.
- Need to look at the condition of watershed as a whole – hydrology, species habitat and forest health.
- BLM needs to find a balance among all laws.
- Economics is a high priority.
- Look at the reality of species use and habitat, not the checkerboard pattern of ownership.
- Avoid relying too much on one idea, i.e. Norm & Jerry. Look at science.

Small Group #2

- Consider an 80-100 year rotation.
- The thinning regime has to be considered, e.g. variable density thinning in homogeneous stands.
- Long rotation, i.e., 300 years, is required to attain a sustainable forest.
- Consideration of rural economies – jobs and employment.
- A timber regime is needed that considers non-timber considerations, i.e. trade-offs between recreation jobs and forestry jobs, tourism, quality of life.
- Employ rapid re-forestation post-disturbance, including salvage.
- Consider a regime that de-emphasizes timber.

Small Group #3

- Will variable retention harvest be included?
- Consider a regime that emphasizes the needs of early seral habitat.
- Limit use of timber to domestic purposes only.
- Post treatment restoration should be built into any program, including site recovery and cleanup.
- Focus silviculture on a multiple objectives approach.
- Focus on adjacent ownership activities.
- Incorporate biodiversity considerations, i.e. new research of effects on light penetration.
- Opportunities for public involvement during implementation should be included.

- Avoid logging burned areas.
- Maybe log burned areas where appropriate.
- Sustained yield requires a longer rotation trend.
- Consider uneven age, multiple tree species, or multiple cohorts.
- Manage for a mixed diversity of timber species and ages, rather than employing a monoculture approach.

Clean Water and Healthy Fish

Small Group #1

- Ensure that riparian buffers are adequate to protect water and fish.
- Use the “best” science available.
- Recognize that oceanic influences impact fish.
- Streams are healthy.
- Larger riparian buffers/areas are better for salmon.
- Use sensitivity analysis to explore full range of reasonable alternatives.
- There is a role for active riparian management, i.e. alder stands, diversify species, LWD.
- A large range of buffer width should be analyzed, including NWFP and State buffers and options in between.
- Ocean to spawning areas effect fish.
- Look specifically at fish bearing streams, not all streams have fish.
- Additional protections are needed for municipal water supply.

Small Group #2

- Consider impacts of road construction and maintenance.
- Improve biological productivity of fish; emphasize habitat needs.
- Oregon Forest Practices Act standards should be the standard in all alternatives.
- Analysis would be enhanced with a comprehensive consideration of the watershed conditions that are needed for thriving fish populations.
- Analysis should look at watershed-specific prescriptions and alternatives.
- Analysis should incorporate the latest research, i.e. Mike Newton, Alsea-Trask Paired Watershed Study.
- Recognize the compatibility of modern road management and clean water.
- Consider external (non-BLM) factors on clean water and healthy fish, i.e. private lands and ocean impacts.

Small Group #3

- Define site potential for the public.
- Don't encroach on wilderness; manage adjacent areas as wilderness in order to ensure protection of wilderness values.
- Buffers of 150' horizontal.
- Manage buffers on a stream-by-stream basis.

- Address (treat) invasive species in riparian areas.
- Manage by geomorphology and hydrology; look at the landscape; design stream management by basin by basin.
- Consider a program of flexibility that enables site-by-site management.

Habitat for Owls and other Wildlife

Small Group #1

- Manage for all species; otherwise, they will end up on the threatened and endangered list. Don't only look at threatened and endangered species needs.
- Is there a goal for historical, intact, native vegetation that supports species? Target historical vegetation types.
- Need to consider the value to wildlife of multiple seral stages; a diversity of habitat is necessary to support differing species' needs.
- Be cautious about lumping stands by age via satellite modeling. Consider on-the-ground data.
- Is there a database or inventory of existing habitats and species? Condition of land? Has it been ground-truthed?
- Address the amount of habitat needed for species, rather than focusing on "old growth."

Small Group #2

- What is meant by the term "clusters?" Connectivity should be emphasized.
- What is the relationship between critical habitat and the cluster concept?
- How do large blocks of reserves relate to critical habitat?
- Analysis should include the success rate of the current owl management.
- Plan should reduce the risk of fire and loss from insects.
- Owls need openings for their prey. Regeneration provides essential habitat.
- Relationship of openings and Barred Owl habitat.
- Consider the habitat needs of declining species.
- Manage for common species.

Small Group #3

- Consider approaches to support other species, i.e. elk etc.
- Focus on contiguous habitat.
- Focus on structure based management across landscape instead of reserves.

Old Growth Forest

Small Group #1

- Where can BLM re-grow old growth?
- Consider the historical extent of old growth; multiple stages of forest needed.
- Old growth doesn't belong as a key element. Except where it provides habitat for threatened and endangered, provides for clean water, old growth protection does not have same statutory requirement.

- Consider federally listed plant species?
- Old growth is another economic driver.

Small Group #2

- What law / authority requires protection of old growth?
- What is old growth? Should be structure-based, not age-based.
- How much old growth is enough? RMPs should provide this answer.
- Old growth needs buffers / less fragmentation.
- Recognize the need for old growth forest products.
- Protect trees between the rotation and old growth, i.e. 80-year rotation / protect 120 year old trees.
- What about the 81-119 age class?
- Thinning is not sustainable.
- Old growth will need access (roads) to defend against fire.
- Old growth does not need management.
- Where will future old growth come from?

Small Group #3

- How long can a Doug Fir live?
- Age range should be broad to lower minimum level.
- Base on criteria in addition to age, i.e. duff developed etc.
- Focus designations in “accessible areas.”
- Not a key element in decision process; it is a factor in other considerations.
- Actively manage old growth for resiliency.
- Striking balance? What is minimum processing requirement for export? What are economic drivers?

2) What other factors are of great interest to you? What’s missing?

Small Group #1

- Invasive species.
- Threatened and endangered plant species.
- Carbon sequestration / global warming.
- The human aspect:
 - Economic sustainability
 - Recreation
 - Forest use
 - Scenic values
- Fire management.
- Comprehensive analysis of impacts of past logging and land use practices.
- Do not exclude recreation from lands / large blocks.

- Take broader look at recreation; hunting and fishing benefits from clean water, and economic input.
- Economics is the fourth leg of the stool.
- Timber harvest is part of county revenue stream, also factor in recreation, forest access, etc.
- Consider consolidating lands.

Small Group #2

- Climate change.
- Consideration of various perspectives as to what a forest is for; identify the middle ground.
- Recognition that timber is becoming minimized with each new planning effort.
- Accept that BLM lands are in a checkerboard and are inherently limited.
- Analysis should include cumulative effects including impacts from private land management.
- Consider small business involvement in timber sales for better value and return on timber sales.
- Look to block up lands / land swaps.
- Consider impacts of BLM management on adjoining land owners (fire, insects, etc). Also, impacts of intensive management on nearby land owners.
- A long-term vision for O&C lands should be identified, including impacts to local economies and services.
- Safety issues related to blocks of unmanaged lands, i.e. fire.
- Reciprocal ROW agreements should be preserved.
- Limitations of BLM management should be recognized.
- Consideration of future timber types in the context of climate change.
- Public access restrictions on public lands.
- ROW agreements that do not include public access.
- Determine role of stewardship contracting in BLM land management.
- Consider impacts of stewardship contracting on small business.
- Rule of herbicide use – analyze impacts.

Small Group #3

- Seriously consider a stewardship contract to keep revenues local.
- Recreational opportunities very important. One of the reasons we are here – we visit the area.

3) Do you have any other comments regarding the RMPs for Western Oregon?

Small Group #1

- Are rural economies and industry on the table, i.e. timber, recreation, tourism, additional revenues?
- Please provide maps.
- Explore outer boundaries of alternatives.
- BLM needs to ensure cooperating agencies comply with rules – confirm your science.
- Manage the forest for plant and animal species -- threatened / endangered and not threatened / endangered.

- Fire management.
- Carbon sequestration and global warming.
- Economic analysis.
- Fire suppression is priority and requires road access.
- Non-consumptive values of resources should be accounted for in an economic analysis.
- Eco-system services.
- Presidential Executive Order 13433 – hunting, heritage and wildlife conservation (2007) needs to be complied with.

Small Group #2

- Divide lands among the various interests.
- Climate change? Not included.
- AMS issue with economics (inaccurate information).
- Provide an analysis that is not limited by legal framework.

C. Input Sheets

Ten participants completed the input form.

1. *Are there other options for these four Key Elements that we should consider?*

Element One: Sustainable Timber

- Generating revenue should not be the driving factor – it should be a byproduct of sound, scientifically based, and balanced land management. Consider both short-term and long-term impacts of activities.
- Need to consider sustainable volume to provide income to communities and counties, to meet 1937 O&C Act.
- Constrain extracted revenue to domestic use. Do not permit shipping logs offshore. Address post-logging restoration. Avoid mono-culture replanting.
- Timber harvests targets should take into account to help sustain Oregon’s rural communities.
- Landscape/ownership/National Forest Lands must be considered. This element should be economy with timber and recreation and aesthetics under it. Counties can get revenue from recreation – in fact more revenue than from timber. Look at science; don’t use “ecological forestry” which is not based on science.
- Clean harvest and post harvest practices.
- Economics – public land that can assist local economy. Our schools did not have the issues back in the 60’s. With that said, the timber needs to be managed to be diverse.
- Retain ranges for retention in alternatives – there is no one-size-fits-all. Consider landscape, not each site, to achieve balance. Provide for species diversity.

Element Two: Clean Water and Healthy Fish

- Need to consider current riparian buffers with both passive and some active management. Not just reductions from current. Consider both short term and long term impacts of activities.
- Apply some riparian management rules to non-fish streams as the fish streams (the fish may return) where there is potential.

- Landscape/ownership/ National Forest Lands must be considered. Use science – need larger riparian buffers; consider hyporheic zone; Oregon Forest Practice Rules do not meet needs for clean water or fish.
- Buffer zone of 150 feet around streams.
- Consolidate riparian zone rules. How can BLM manage if neighbor next door cuts timber next to water? I.e. one riparian zone law for all.
- Retain current Northwest Forest Plan buffers, but allow for active management to increase riparian structural and functional diversity, including LWD source. Consider fit with USFS management and meeting Northwest Forest Plan.

Element Three: Habitat for Owls and other Wildlife

- How will the plan mesh with critical habitat requirements? Consider allowing natural disturbance processes (fire, disease, etc) create natural habitats. Consider both short term and long term impacts of activities.
- Allowing for consideration of all species not just T & E species. Combine Element Three and Four – they are the same.
- Manage lands adjacent to protect it, especially clearing underbrush for fire suppression.
- Landscape/ownership/ National Forest Lands must be considered. Can't use satellite data to type stands – need to know based on on-the-ground data what is in each stand i.e. a stand types as 60 years old with remnant trees is not a 60 year old stand, you have to consider the remnant trees that provide housing for Marbled Murrelet.
- Consideration for all game species not just the “politically hot” owls.
- There are 120 species. Don't just think about the owls. These others are in decline too. Don't let them go endangered.
- Ensure there are not isolated islands of old-growth species, so good flow can occur.
- ESA focus highlights old growth habitat. Also need to other seral stages, provide ungulate habitat. Again, landscape-scale goals, with corridors and connectivity, across multiple seral stages. Be clear and transparent about stand-age and habitat mapping criteria. Recognize on the ground structural criteria, occupation by listed species. Grow into old growth stands to increase habitat coherence of landscape. Active management for a variety of seral stages, and long-term cycles.

Element Four: Old Growth Forest

- Thank you for adding protecting old forests as a key element. It is essential. Please also address how the plan will recover / restore old growth habitat.
- Look at historic makeup of the forest. Add other species plant and animal.
- Combine with Element 3. Add revenue and economics as Element Four and have it as an explicit goal.
- 120 feet is too high for minimum. Consider 100 years as a cut off. Look at defining “Old Growth Characteristic” and protecting that.
- Landscape/ownership/ National Forest Lands must be considered. Need on-the-ground data to type stands, cannot use satellite imagery or modeling.
- Consider harvesting these also; before they succumb to old age or disease.
- BLM is a checkerboard. Is consolidation thought valuable? Easier to manage land is larger chunk than little pieces.
- Categorize by old-growth quality, not age.

- Recreation and human use. Revenue to counties, but shouldn't be the burden of BLM alone. Land ownership consolidation. Back to Jim's intro comments – maybe USFA can't control human population growth, but perhaps BLM can.

2. *There are many other factors that BLM will be considering in developing this RMP. What other factors are of great interest to you?*

- Considering the impacts of the plans and activities on carbon storage and climate change. How will the plan and its activities consider other economic contributions of the land – such as recreation, tourism, quality of life, clean drinking water, scenery, etc? How will the plan mesh with the Northwest Forest Plan?
- The declining populations of many wildlife species in Western Oregon. The recreation activities of hunting and fishing and economic contribution of these activities.
- When BLM land is adjacent to protected wilderness treat that BLM land as wilderness. Include recreational needs especially access to hiking and boating. Consider any river adjacent lands as wild and scenic eligible.
- OHV Trail Recreation. I would like the BLM to establish motorized trail recreation on O&C lands.
- Murrelets are not owls – need to consider Murrelets' needs. Anything greater than 60 years with trees with structure is Murrelet habitat. Using "eco-forestry" division or 120 years is not appropriate. "Eco-forestry" totally ignores Murrelets needs so should not be used. Need to consider predators, microclimate and impacts on species' needs.
- Land management for big game species.

3. *Any other comments regarding the RMPs for Western Oregon?*

- Good maps of existing condition including surrounding landscape management and proposed plans should be available ASAP. Thank you for holding these meetings, more notice and more locations (like Eugene) would be better.
- Thanks for the outreach in this effort. (3)
- Please do not forget the "serve the people" part of your motto. The people of Oregon are also important to the outcome of your plan. I hope your plan is balanced – this sounds very difficult. Thank you for this opportunity.
- Involve the scientists, not just agency biologists or USFWS biologists. You need the scientists at the table from the beginning. Need to consider short-term impacts, not just long-term. "Eco-forestry" focuses on creating diversity in the far future but ignores the impacts on wildlife, microclimate, etc in the short term.
- Connectivity of isolated land. This is not available for recreation if land locked by private land.

2. LOCATION: MEDFORD

Date: December 10, 2013

Attendance: 60

A. Plenary Session Q/A

How often does BLM revise RMP's?

A: There is not a set timeframe or year trigger, the RMP was evaluated and found that it was not meeting targets and that there was new information that needs to be addressed.

What happened with the last plan (WOPR)?

A: The 2008 RMP was not successful because the Record of Decision was withdrawn. For this Plan, BLM is using the 2008 analysis where possible and adding to it where needed. Because the ROD was withdrawn, BLM is operating under the 1995 RMP and a lot of the Plan is out of date.

What does the NWP have to do with this plan?

A: This RMP will be a revision of the 1995 RMPs, which incorporated the Northwest Forest Plan.

Where does recreation fall in this Plan?

A: Recreation is identified in the P&N; however, it was not a “key element” for this outreach session because we are still developing preliminary approaches to recreation. It will be included in the RMP as a major feature of each alternative, and the alternatives will differ in their approaches to providing recreation opportunities.

Seems lack of recreation is a glaring oversight.

A: Recreation is critically important it just isn’t one of the things we are covering in this particular public meeting.

Think that recreation should be up there with the other 4 key elements.

A: Recreation is critically important; it just isn’t one of the things we are covering in this particular public meeting.

Fire – fire resistant notion is not there now and should be a primary driver. Why is it not?

A: Good comment. As described in the Purpose and Need, increasing fire resiliency is one of the planning effort’s purposes. It will be addressed in much greater depth in the draft RMP/EIS. The key elements are not an inclusive list of the issues that will be addressed in the planning effort.

Is recreation not here because of the need to comply with the other Acts?

A: Recreation is in O&C Act and FLPMA and providing recreational opportunities is a component of the Purpose and Need. There are lots of other important things that will be in the RMP, but not at this step in our public outreach.

Matrix lands under full logging: will this be changed? Fewer roads or road closures open to logging?

A: We are revising the 1995 RMPs. As such, we will be considering different land use allocations including those allocations that have objectives for sustained-yield timber harvest. Regarding road building, discuss later.

Process question – what will happen once the public submits comments – how will they be handled this time? It would be nice to know this for transparency.

A: We are here tonight to share our thinking early in the planning process, which is different. In terms of comments – we will provide a summary of what we heard in all of these Community Listening Sessions. The summary report will be shared with BLM managers, planning team specialists, and district staff. It will also be available to our Cooperating Agencies and to the general public. Then, during the formal

public comment period for Planning Criteria, we will come back out again to public to share where we are at and let the public know what we did with the comments.

A lot of arguments with harvest works out to economics – modeling economics is tough, but it seems incumbent on BLM to do an economic analysis.

A:

- 1) There is strong emphasis in BLM's Analysis of the Management Situation on economics
- 2) BLM has retained a contractor to help do this exact analysis – BLM doesn't have enough economists on staff to do this modeling, so we are using a contractor who has modeling capacity that intersects with our work.
- 3) Modeling and outputs will be included as part of our analysis.

B. Small Group Discussion

In this session, three small groups were convened. Input is organized by question.

1) Are there other options for the Key Elements that BLM should consider?

Sustainable Timber

Small Group #1

- Sustainable forest addresses the whole forest. Will not reach sustainable timber if only focusing on timber.
- What's the difference between maintaining forest and maintaining the ecosystem?
- Protecting all remaining forest greater than 100 years will yield sustainable forest ultimately.
- Predictable supply of timber is needed. What do we have now?
 - Not sustainable.
 - Overcut in the 1960s – 1980s.
 - Overgrown / flammable.
- Explore cost difference between (economics of) clearing brush and the difference between preventing or putting the fire out.
- Economics should not determine sustainable timber levels – need to consider other factors, i.e. weather.
- Disappointed with O&C management. Need to work out a balance between timber and recreation.
- The number of clearcuts from the early 80's that have re-grown is increasing.
- Economic benefits of the whole forest need to be considered.
- Applegate AMP takes into account the full ecosystem so timber is not the sole driver.
- Healthy forests attract residents and visitors. This is a basis for a sustainable economy.
- I am anti-new roads for timber management due to long-term negative effects. Skid roads for harvest (from the 40's and 50's) are not being used. Putting in new roads could be on those old roads.
- If you manage understory (preventing fire, road construction can be done correctly.
- Need to evaluate environmental impacts of harvest methods.

- Roads become way to keep users off forest.
- Does BLM do clearcuts? No.
- Deer do not survive in all old growth.
- Road system is analyzed every three years through categorical exclusion with no opportunity for public comment. Need transparency in road planning.
- Does BLM Medford have a road plan?

Small Group #2

- More restoration thinning.
- Agree with this but we need a diameter limit, i.e. under 18 inches and an age limit of 100 years.
- O&C lands are 10% of the forest lands in Oregon which were specifically set aside for sustained yield forest production so I believe they should be used for that. Timber management is a complex issue that depends on site specific silvicultural needs and is sustainable.
- There needs to be separate silvicultural prescriptions for the southern Oregon dry lands vs. northern Oregon where it is wetter.
- Upland erosion control and sediment plan needs to be addressed.
- I don't want to see any more ground set aside. I want to see more clear cuts, more production. Take into account a north aspect is different from a south aspect. Also take into account the health of the forest.
- Balance has already been achieved by setting aside O&C lands for production. Clearcuts are critical to wildlife.
- Make sure soil fertility can keep up with projected growth level, don't have an unrealistic idea that soil can keep producing timber.
- Post-fire salvage / logging should be limited for diversity and to allow for more fire recovery.
- Important for BLM to monitor post-harvest (and during harvest) impacts and success rates.
- It's pretty well known that clearcut forests are prone to burn and beetle infestation.
- Replanted areas locally seem to be growing back really well.
- WOPR 2008 newsletter (page 5) excerpt illustrates "super sustainability". Look at the history of what really happened and not just make it up. Over a 50 year period, they harvested over 90% and ended up with more.

Small Group #3

- No monocultural replants; provide a mix appropriate for area, i.e. endemic vegetation.
- What do you mean by sustainable?
 - Based on economics or ecology.
 - Timber volume.
 - Rotation cycle (age class)
- What is purpose of range? Move in direction of retention.
- Given fire and drought cycles, don't see a role for regeneration in dry forests; more selective harvest to maintain a healthy forest.

- BLM over-emphasizes economic importance of timber. Would like to see BLM focus on a multitude of values (ecosystem services, fisheries, recreation, quality of life.), in both short and long term.
- Definition of sustainable timber for SW Oregon needs a different formula than other places on Westside.
- What is the cost of wildlife protection and fire suppression vs. treatments?
- Need legal sufficiency post -NEPA.
- More micro-management.
- Look at relationship between high severity fire and plantation stands.
- Clear-cutting provides food for herbivores and carnivores.
- To achieve sustainable forests, consider something besides a bid process for timber sales; set price for value.
- Sustainable defined ecologically vs. economically.
- Maintain and enhance road systems as a requirement of timber sale.
- Need harvest of standing burned timber.

Clean Water and Healthy Fish

Small Group #1

- Clean water has high value; that value is growing.
- Shouldn't have to worry about clean water if we manage for the full forest.
- Clean water / fish depend on healthy forest. Lots of revenue brought into healthy forests.
- Need to assess the effects of mining, fracking, roads, dams, pipelines on watersheds.
- NWFP created watershed analysis – need update to this.
- Protect and manage streams from the source.
- Intermittent streams contribute to the watershed.
- Buffer zones/riparian zones need to be maximized.
- Need to consider neighboring landowners when discussing buffer / riparian zones.
- Checkerboard land ownership pattern results in some streams not being managed for clean water values. Landowner should get incentive for providing restoration, management, and buffer zones on their lands.
- Partnerships to manage riparian areas should be maximized.
- Cost of conservation is a big issue and deterrent.
- Lay of the ground should determine riparian zone size. Cannot have a single management approach across the board; cannot apply one size fits all.
- Streams should have water at least half of the year.
- Every stream flows to the next. We need to protect the fish for recreation and food value.
- Need to look into historical fish populations and potential for restoration.
- NWFP has formula for calculating buffer zones. We need to re-examine how that buffer works.

Small Group #2

- Riparian reserves should be maintained on all streams, both intermittent and ephemeral.
- No logging, no entry in riparian reserves, need to expand riparian buffers.
- No more road building; we need to shut down roads to prevent sediment entering the streams.
- We need roads for fire access.
- 1937 Hydraulic mining studies showed no impact to fish.
- Be careful with runoff – you can still avoid sedimentation.
- What is a site potential tree?
- Industry needs to be consulted in project planning. They have a lot to offer in reducing sedimentation impacts.
- Management for temperature should be site-specific.
- Need erosion and sediment control plans that are site-specific, done in the field, including protection of roads.
- Vary boundaries on non-fish-bearing streams.
- Important that heavy equipment not run over springs.
- If you want a healthy habitat you have to have in-stream restoration along with any activity.
- If you have temporary roads that you want to leave open for fire control, ensure they are water-barred.
- Need to look at potential for in-stream logs being washed down in a high water year.
- Withdraw key watersheds from mineral entry.
- Limit livestock grazing in riparian areas.
- With clean water and healthy fish, you make the recreation people happy.
- Need to consider economic implications of buffer zones.

Small Group #3

- NWFP stream buffers should be maintained.
- No value currently on intermittent streams – need buffers in key areas, i.e. riparian reserves. Pay special attention to stream connectivity.
- Look at road densities in the watershed, specifically road locations and relation to sedimentation, turbidity, water quality.
- Identify areas year-round to withdrawal from mineral entry in key watersheds / salmon spawning area – salmon / steelhead.
- Effect of large stand replacement fires, i.e. stream buffers. Fire travels along buffers and causes clean water to be at risk.
- Monitor erosion – have remediation, terminate roads causing problems.
- Match timber harvest techniques with slope to prevent erosion issues. Should not allow clearcut in some areas.
- Agency should analyze amount of roads in system based on amount of funding now and in future.

Habitat for Owls and other Wildlife

Small Group #1

- Maintain diversity of forest to protect wildlife.
- Replanted areas – can't get through / fire hazard.
- Clearcuts work in some places but not here.
- Species only applies to non-vegetation. We need to manage for plant life too.
- BLM thinning project took out all manzanita. Manzanita is part of our ecosystem.
- Clusters will have fire and we need to mitigate to at least lessen the impact.
- Short- term losses of habitat for long-term gain to help promote habitat.
- Pheasant population is not native. When possum came in took out the pheasant. Barred Owl will replace the Spotted Owl.
- Spotted Owl is an indicator species in old growth. There are a lot of other species to pay attention to as well. Anything over 100 years should be hub of restoration to give species a chance to survive fragmentation of forest.
- Eventually all will be greater than 100 years. Age cannot continue to be criteria because of this. Need to set aside designated areas.
- Forest management is not a cookie cutter process. Special class of nature places need to be preserved.
- Should not limit the definition of reserved area. Should protect pockets of unique pieces of forest. People want to see these, i.e. recreation users.
- Don't see the problem with going on trails with owls in trees. Studies show that Spotted Owl is not affected by recreation.
- Humans don't understand complex ecosystem. How do we make decisions based on fact not politics?
- BLM should have same stewardship authority as US Forest Service. County's get economic credit for stewardship projects on Forest Service Land but not BLM.

Small Group #2

- BLM needs to work to continue biodiversity which will help keep recreationists happy.
- Because of O&C mandate, USFWS should be required to prove owl inventory results.
- BLM is compromising its legal obligation on a bunch of conjecture.
- Remove humans from the equation and let the owls work out what will happen naturally.
- How are we going to balance this element when it is required by law?
- The owls have been there for generations and they'll be there again. A well-managed forest is a beautiful forest and a forest with nothing managed (not thinned) is a catastrophic forest fire waiting to happen.
- Review studies of Spotted Owl and Barred Owl.
- Consider the potential impact of rat poison from pot growers on owl's prey species.
- Since there's a very, very small sliver of federal lands set aside for timber production (on O&C lands), it should be exempted from the Endangered Species Act.
- Court case says that the USFWS needs to re-do their owl habitat.

- Wildlife will follow/move for habitat requirements.
- We need to have protected connectivity corridors for wildlife because wildlife needs a chance to move throughout the system.
- BLM needs to inventory all roadless areas for botanical species of concern so they can be protected. BLM needs to have protected botanical areas like the USFS does.
- We need to have non-motorized areas for wildlife refugia.

Small Group #3

- Maintain corridors for wildlife migration not just provide disconnected blocks of timber.
- Corridor concept is vital – we need connectivity across landscape between Spotted Owl nesting sites, LSRs. Need analysis to determine where and if large contiguous land blocks exist.
- Herbivores depend on early stage timber, under 20 years.
- Want wildlife and plant surveys funded and completed before and after treatments. Use info to enhance health and protection of species.
- Because of recreational value of wildlife viewing, it has tremendous economic value.
- BLM should conduct an analysis of the Barred Owl on the Spotted Owl and compare to other critical habitat issues, connectivity, and predation issues. Before and after treatment.
- Consider use of prescribed fire to manage for wildlife habitat, particularly herbivores. Consider need for thermal cover.

Old Growth Forest

Small Group #1

- Set asides have proven to have recreation value. BLM is not used to being a recreation agency. Need to change this. Redwoods are a great example.
- Near Wolf Creek Inn, there are 1500 acres of old growth forest. Recreation value is incredible.

Small Group #2

- You can't have sustainable timber harvest and still maintain for old growth – to me that would be two different forests.
- It's important to protect timber that is 80 years and older to protect the middle-aged forests.
- BLM needs to protect all trees 100 years and older.
- BLM needs to create more wilderness and backcountry areas to protect more old growth.
- BLM should not log in any unentered lands.
- Diameter limit to represent age is hard to determine and may not correlate.
- What is meant by "protect" – not letting them burn?
- Need to have a control group to compare what nature does vs. human management of forests.
- What is old growth depends on the species and site specific conditions, not necessarily age or diameter.
- I would go with 200 years or more on O&C lands.
- It is a mistake to define old growth in terms of an arbitrary number of years – need to look at NWFP definitions.

Small Group #3

- Basic premise is that BLM should not cut any old growth.
- BLM needs to be more straightforward about defining old growth. Any range should reflect the structural complexity of the old growth.
- Old growth should include forests with trees that are currently 120-160 years old.
- Need a transparent understandable standard that can be followed.
- Stands that are younger should be managed for future old growth.
- Need emphasis on managing mid-seral habitat to create more old growth.
- Establish standard for amount of old growth that balances all uses.
- Defining old growth is like defining people – some are old at 20 and others at 80. Need to micro-manage.

2) What other factors are of great interest to you? What's missing?

Small Group #1

- Recreation has just as much value. Recreation should be just as important as the four key elements.
- Other resources have economic value.
- BLM should create division of tourism.
- Tourism is future of Oregon. Can't keep cutting down resources forever.
- Tourism can be engine to provide sustainable forest.
- This area is beautiful place to live. Want recreation on BLM forests.

Small Group #2

- Recreation: \$670 million / year on BLM land, which is twice as much as logging brings in.
- A perspective needs to be looked at to balance all needs, not just those who feel entitled to extract resources from federal land for the benefit of a few.
- BLM needs to do more Rx burning and allow for more natural fire recovery after fire events.
- Consider the educational opportunities that the land offers.
- Coordinate with county plans.
- Economic sustainability.
- Fire management.

3) Do you have any other comments regarding the RMPs for Western Oregon?

Small Group #1

- We have to be willing to pay higher taxes. Tax payers need to pay more real estate taxes.
- Sustainability – all counties are hurting. We need a balance for the 100 year timeframe, not just immediate.
- Too bad counties cannot recognize revenue from recreation.
- Balancing the four key elements is BLM's job. We have to be honest about the current situation. Need to work toward balance in long term.
- We need to face the fact that we will not get much timber money out of this.

- Best managed forest lands belong to private industry. They are not primarily in it for the money, are not anti-harvest and are investing in land for their families.
- BLM timber sales for commercial operators – could do small contracts. Putting people to work and ending up with healthier forests.
- PSQ or ASQ have been driving forces for management on public lands. Instead should manage for economic sustainability.
- Fire management / thinning is very important. But shouldn't stop fires completely.

Small Group #2

- Must maintain diversity.
- Recognize uniqueness of ecosystem.

Small Group #3

- Designate target practice areas to make recreation safe.
- Recreation – why is it not a key element?
- The importance of human activity is less important than timber and other elements.
- Recreation has more economic value than timber harvest.
- Consider impacts in total, i.e. on adjoining private lands. Impacts of private land that will impact health of streams, wildlife connectivity on landscape level. Look at cumulative effects.
- Consider creating new designations for key resources. RNAs, botanical areas, wildlife connectivity.
- Inventory Westside roadless areas.
- WOPR didn't show timber revenues when prices plummet, so counties know what to expect.

C. Input Sheets

Twenty-one participants completed the input form.

Are there other options for these Key Elements that we should consider?

Element One: Sustainable Timber

- Sustainable forestry – work toward converting current situation to long-term (100 years) sustainability. Such forests will provide economic, social, etc. predictability.
- Forest – a forest is not just timber to be milled.
- Southern Oregon dry forests need to be treated less often than wetter northern and coastal forests. Different silviculture prescriptions for dry forests.
- Must be sustainable in reality.
- Sustainable ecosystem not just timber.
- Any sale of timber from public BLM lands should be based on restoration thinning. In my view, 30% retention is still clear-cutting.
- Site specific management, based on the specific silvicultural conditions of the stand. Sustained – yield harvest dictates that we don't harvest more than we growth. With respect to those two principles we should maximize harvest son these lands for economic benefit of O&C counties, in accordance with the O&C Act.

- In the long-term i.e. 100 years or more, not decade by decade.
- Need to limit volume in sensitive areas i.e. dry Southwest Oregon forests. How much needs to be harvested to satisfy O&C?
- A forest with a wide diversity of size and species is much less susceptible to fire and beetle damage. Clear cuts lead to sick, fire-prone and beetle death prone forests. Learn from Colorado's bad experience with tens of thousands of acres of beetle death.
- Rogue does not appear to be selective logging. Sustainable – if this is economic then the economic analysis should include value – qualitative and quantitative of wilderness, wildlife, old growth, quality of life, recreation, ecological. Economic should incorporate public values, not private profits. Sustainable should mean ecological.
- Sustainable defined in terms of ecology not economics. Reflect Southwestern Oregon's unique climate. Sustainable will have a different set of requirements here due to climate differences with the rest of Oregon.
- Bid process in timber sales under value public land. Public resources should not be valued at a comparable level to private. Set a price for timber that returns both short and long-term interests. If no buyers then save for the future.
- Clearcut on BLM lands?
- Full transparency of interests and plans. Need diameter limit of 18 inches. Zero clear cuts. Need to research species specific, ecosystem specific needs for individual and cluster health. Limit post fire salvage logging to leave this rare land to recover naturally as history has done in the past to provide diversity to BLM/public lands.
- If the organic growth rate is 1.2 billion board feet (if there was no harvest), then "sustainable yield" to mitigate catastrophic wildlife is 1.2 billion board feet. Balance. The O&C counties have not seen "balance" since the 1970s, which is about 40 years.
- Want timber companies to manage/harvest "their previously harvested" tree farms – not continuously target old growth. They should earn access by conscientious harvesting history.
- O&C.

Element Two: Clean Water and Healthy Fish

- Acknowledge integration of all water sources.
- Extremely important for erosion and sediment control plans that area site specific to keep streams clean and healthy.
- This should be number one. Manage from headwaters to sea.
- Maintain riparian reserves on all streams both intermittent (season) and year round.
- Need a healthy forest to be clean water and healthy fish.
- Reduce impact of timber harvesting and recreation on water systems.
- Riparian reserves should be protected as currently protected in the Northwest Forest Plan. Streams need maximum forest buffers.
- Varying boundaries on non-fish bearing streams, on a site-specific basis. Erosion control plans for roads, with water bars to direct sediment away from streams. We need mitigation not elimination of roads. Roads are necessary for recreation, timber production and fire management.
- Strong buffer zones that include public and private partnerships.
- NWFP stream buffers should be maintained.

- Maintain riparian buffers – no commercial logging or mining activities. No new roads phase out existing old unused roads. Enforce ORV use restrictions with better signage and fences/gates. Bring damaged areas back to health by setting it aside.
- These should inform sustainable in sustainable timber. Maintain and expand buffers. Intermittent streams are important to protect like other streams. Eliminate mining in key watersheds / salmon habitat. Eliminating roads and conduct remediation for streams.
- Maintain riparian reserves. Intermittent streams still need buffers. Match timber harvest on steep slopes to avoid erosion.
- The current RMP has strong language again allowing any motorized trails in riparian areas. This makes designing a trail system almost impossible. There must be a way to cross riparian even if it requires special care, with motorized trails.
- Properly managed forests provide clean water and healthy fish.
- No more road building i.e. temporary roads on BLM. They have an impact with allowing more sediment to runoff into streams. Keep/honor riparian buffer zones for commercial logging and pilot programs. Put into consideration certain ecotypes might require a larger buffer. Update old (over 100 years old) mining laws to involve current economic and ecological conditions.
- Both objectives in this element can be met if the aforementioned mitigation of catastrophic wildfires was/is performed by a responsible agency. Can that be the BLM?
- Want to see policy changes for mining operations that reduce / restrict small stream access and limit the need for habitat remediation at public expense for private profit.
- Clean Water Act. Careful planning for timber harvesting and roads affecting riparian harvest.

Element Three: Habitat for Owls and other Wildlife

- Maintain diversity of southern Oregon forests.
- Wildlife species have been going extinct for millions of years. Often replaced by a stronger species. Maybe we should bring back the saber tooth tiger to help control population.
- BLM has been on a mission to fragment all large areas of wildlands. You were very successful. Now you need to save every last pocket of intact older forest.
- Determine impact of forest management on entire ecosystem. Do we support one species like the Spotted Owl over another, like Barn Owls? Is so, why? What are long-term impacts of that approach?
- All critical habitat for Spotted Owls, Coho Salmon and other threatened wildlife should be protected.
- The ESA says that economic hardship must be taken into consideration when designation critical habitat. In the case of economic hardship the Secretary can exempt land from critical habitat. By definition, production on the O&C lands area necessary for the economic stability of the O&C counties. These lands should be exempted/excluded from critical habitat designation.
- Element three and four should be combined.
- Establish corridors for plants and wildlife, especially to mitigate climate change.
- Light grazing can be consistent with healthy forests and rivers. Heavy grazing ruins habitat for generations. A good guideline is to allow domestic animals only if wild animals and plants are not impaired.
- Build, expand connected large areas. Contiguous blocks for all kinds of wildlife, more than and including migrating corridors and endangered species habitat. Complete the wildlife and plant surveys before and after.

- Management of wildlife to protect and insure its diversity has enormous economic value. Has a huge impact on recreation values and enjoyment.
- Responsible “sustainable” stewardship should/must include responsible “sustainable” timber harvest.
- Retain old growth zones for forest health and fauna habitat.
- ESA.

Element Four: Old Growth Forest

- Recognize unique characteristics of small plots even less than one acre.
- Old growth areas will disappear when they get older due to lack of new growth in those areas. Old growth areas have little potential for sustainability.
- What’s “old growth” on the Applegate is not the same as Evans Creek.
- Need to consider size and age of trees, not just age.
- Save what is left.
- Controlled forest fires are necessary for long-term stability.
- Forests 80 years and older should be protected. 120 years at an absolutely minimum.
- O&C is a tiny fraction (<10%) of federal forest land in Oregon, specifically mandated for sustained yield timber production. There is lots of other land that can be set aside for old growth management. Mills like Rough & Ready that went out of business (costing many jobs in an economically depressed county) because of no large diameter timber, need 80-120 year old trees.
- Structural complexity.
- Create more wilderness and back country areas with trail access so the educational value of old growth forests can be realized and enjoyed by the many willing to leave their cars and hike in nature.
- Manage to grow and restore old growth in addition to preservation of old growth.
- Define old growth clearly, includes diverse forests.
- Hard to define.
- Unconditionally keep old growth forests intact and keep trees (species specific) 100 years and older standing. There are only a fraction of these trees that exist. Keep them.
- Define the phrase. For the love of “environomic” sanity, please decide how this phrase can be measured: go/no-go, pass/fail.
- Yes. Retain. Restrict from commercial exploitation. Fire management policies. Limited road access to sensitive areas.
- FLMPA.

There are many other factors that BLM will be considered in developing this RMP. What other factors are of great interest to you?

- Machine recreation must be segregated.
- Recreation. I am older and can no longer hike greater than 5 miles per day; therefore road use is necessary to me and many Middle Rogue Steelheaders to have access to use BLM lands.
- Recreation. Recreation. Recreation.
- Non-motorized recreation.
- Recreation, specifically non-motorized. No clear cuts. No new roads. Change policy to (for OHVs) “closed unless posted open.” Keep the Applegate Adaptive Management Area.

- Long-term and local economic benefits of recreation in forest lands. Public support of forest sustainability processes based upon their knowledge and experience of local forests through participation in recreational activities.
- I value opportunities for quiet recreation – money should be allocated to build trails. BLM lands should not be sacrificed as ORV playgrounds – ORVs destroy habitat for wildlife and clean water.
- Economic sustainability for O&C counties. Roads are necessary for fire management and recreation. Need more salvage harvesting of burned timber.
- Recreation and the economic benefits derived from restoring all remaining older forests (100 years plus.)
- BLM should manage land and consider its effect on adjacent private lands and vice versa. Landscape management. This would affect streams too.
- Education – we can help all people and especially young people learn about nature and the natural sciences by preserving wild areas i.e. BLM special places. Our future depends on a population that cares about all life and remembers special insights gained when they were in nature.
- Recreation – non-motorized. Its economic contribution and its reliance on existence of clean water, old growth, wildlife and diversity.
- Recreation should be a key element. Non-motorized recreation is the single largest recreational activity in Oregon.
- Economics of recreation. Impacts of private land extraction and use on totality of greater landscape including public land.
- Recreation is just as important as the four key elements. It should be a key element and considered from the beginning as equally important.
- Getting some sustainable yield.
- Access to recreational opportunities including hiking, rafting, wildlife viewing, botanical reserves, old growth clusters. Access for wildlife to migrate and sustain a quality of life.
- Economic modeling is extremely important, so balance can be achieved. Again, each and every decision must pass the common sense scrutiny of the other side of the balanced scale – “environomic” criteria.
- Recreational usage that does not compromise the health of the land and respects the needs of competing recreational interests i.e. ORV can be particularly destructive.
- Limiting mining methods and scope within rivers, streams and riparian habitat. White water recreation opportunities.

Any other comments regarding the RMPs for Western Oregon?

- Value of recreation: \$670,000/year.
- I like the fact that you’re providing multiple opportunities for input and review.
- Chinese proverb – plan for the 7th generation.
- Not enough value has been given for recreation. It’s hard to quantify but the economics in Southern Oregon are huge, maybe even more than timber.
- Shift BLM priorities toward forest and watershed restoration. Achieve economic objectives through restoration activities. Include public in forest management and developing recreation opportunities. Preserve older forests. Restore Oregon’s Salmon and Steelhead runs. Don’t build new roads.
- Recreation needs much more emphasis in this plan.
- When projecting timber revenue, consider price fluctuations.

- In my area (Greensprings Mountain) there are important riparian habitats administered by the Bureau of Reclamation adjacent to BLM lands. Can there be a collaboration in protecting the ecological factors that cross the BLM/BOR boundaries i.e. Emigrant Creek Wetlands.
- Designate target practice areas. Insures safety for other recreation users. Maintain gates to prevent dumping and other damage.
- Let wildlands burn. Spend expenses on protecting development. It is part of its natural history. Not fighting fires in place it should be and is useful for forest health.
- Federally-funded neo-environmentalists have been nearly impossible to defeat in court. The legal playing field must be leveled in order for any progress to be made.
- We would appreciate other streams of income from these lands excluding timber / mining extraction. Policies that promote carbon credit exchanges, revenues from mushrooms or recreation or ?

3. LOCATION: COOS BAY

Date: December 11, 2013

Attendance: 34

A. Plenary Session Q/A

Will you be addressing Wyden's proposal?

A: Not necessarily; we will include the full spectrum of reasonable alternatives that respond to the Purpose and Need for action.

Timber is our first concern because money is our biggest concern. The mandates are to create management plans that put timber number 1, right?

A: Providing for a sustained yield of timber is one of the purposes of the plan. All alternatives analyzed in detail must respond to all of the purposes identified in the Purpose and Need statement.

Why are you having small group discussions instead of a crowd?

A: It gives us more opportunity to hear more people's input and we know you all came to give input.

Can BLM run without money?

A: No. And that is not a focus of these discussions, the RMP is.

Federal or state plans – if the State's plan manages to be more in tune with industry (e.g. buffers around riparian areas) how can the State pre-empt the Federal Plan?

A: BLM is looking to find a balance in our Plan with buffers to help the ESA listed species on Federal lands.

I looked at your spreadsheets – and it is nice to see this informal approach to the topic. In all you are doing, where do humans fit in the balance?

A: Good point.

Ditto to last comment; A balanced plan needs to include economic revenue generation.

Why are you keeping this discussion separated from O&C legislation?

A: BLM is in the middle of a planning process that we need to finish based on current directives. If the legislation were to pass, then that would be a new directive that we would follow. But if legislation stops and nothing happened, we would not have plan. BLM wants an updated plan ASAP.

How many people in Oregon work with BLM and the ocean? I'm excited and care about water, fish and recreation. Are you working with green renewable energy?

A: Let's address that in small groups.

B. Small Group Discussion

In this session, two small groups were convened. Input is organized by question.

1) Are there other options for the Key Elements that BLM should consider?

Sustainable Timber

Small Group #1

- Clear cut in small patches – mimic nature for nature.
- Need to analyze the loss of elk / deer habitat.
- Consider overall timber industry cultural – new technology, society's need for wood products.
- Social / economic needs. Global and / or local?
- Qualify the term “sustainable” – what do we need.
- Clarify – is sustained yield or max sustained yield the goal?
- Consider greater than 30% retention – why narrowed down already?
- Need to have regeneration harvest (cc, shelter wood, seed tree.) Thinning not long term.
- Clearcuts are not same as burns. Large trees left behind after burn. Important to have science to back up management directions, make logic clear.
- Do retention percentages have to do with economics?
- More separation between economics and science discussions / decisions.
- Concerned about clean drinking water. Ban pesticides / herbicides.
- Concern clearcuts will cause erosion. Clearcuts should be small. Make size slope dependent. Clearcuts should be on non-steep slopes.
- There shouldn't be an age / size limitation.
- Plan on district level with IDT; make more outcome based for district level goals.
- What is maximum harvest level of all forests? Do we define a limit – parameters on how much timber to cut?

Small Group #2

- Separate O&C from CBWR for sustained yield calculations. Calculate sustained yield separately.
- Thinning as a preferred treatment.
- Do varying levels of retention as part of timber harvest.
- Are counties involved in the RMP process? Specifically in regards to economic impacts.
- Manage for wildlife resiliency.

- How do we determine what techniques are used for timber harvest?
- Maintain riparian and steep slopes as set-asides to not be harvested.
- Clear cuts are important in these coastal forests – use varying rotation ages, i.e. 60 – 120 – 160.
- Reexamine how BLM auctions timber sales.
- Thinning does not result in regenerating Douglas fir.
- Purpose and Need statement – how can BLM maintain national water quality, i.e. mineral balance.
- What is process for designating wilderness?
- Keep BLM lands accessible to public for wide variety of uses.
- What is BLM’s road management plan?

Clean Water and Healthy Fish

Small Group #1

- Use latest research to establish buffer widths. Buffer strips in NWFP are excessive.
- Need more information / transparency on when / where / what chemicals related to herbicides.
- Consider logging impacts on sediment.
- Good science on sediment load in streams – incorporate science in plan, make it peer reviewed science.
- Better to have paved roads in the forest.
- Recognize how many roads on BLM lands are not being maintained. Disconnect roads from management.
- Set goals / outcomes based on timeframes.
- Incorporate baseline fish / salmon data into plan.
- Active watershed councils especially in Curry County. Clear cutting needed dependent on locations on landscape. Look at landscape. One BLM plan for the whole state not appropriate. Needs to depend on sites and local knowledge.

Small Group #2

- BLM has good buffers. No spraying herbicides.
- Have buffers wider than industry.
- One buffer size does not fit everywhere. Use site-specific buffers. Consider soils, topography, aspect, etc. Intermittent vs. perennial / fish bearing.
- Concern on use of herbicides.

Habitat for Owls and other Wildlife

Small Group #1

- Barred Owl impacts need to be considered in management. Look at management options to deal with Barred Owl.
- Consider whether the MaMu is really endangered.
- Habitat loss is really the reason for the declining population of Northern Spotted Owl.
- Maintain enough habitat for Northern Spotted Owl and Barred Owl.

- Important to have species spread across the states.
- Need to protect Spotted Owl nest trees. Surveys from now on are not valid because Northern Spotted Owl has moved on due to Barred Owl invasion. Northern Spotted Owl will move back once Barred Owl is gone.
- Do invasive species treatments under a Categorical Exclusion. Important to move quickly.
- Protection for plovers is overkill – need access to New River. Need policy on how much can be shut down if plovers found.
- Treat gorse and beach grass to improve plover habitat.
- Don't include Northern Spotted Owl critical habitat in timber harvests.
- Assessment of biodiversity before Norm & Jerry cuts, compared to biodiversity after harvest. Survey to see if treatments are really needed. Important to identify how we'll assess success of treatments.
- Address economic impact of lack of deer / elk hunting habitat due to protection of habitat for owls.
- Concerned we will create more habitat for Barred Owl.
- Make arguments against sister agency conclusions / requirements. Challenge policies.
- Got enough habitat for snowy plover.

Small Group #2

- Evaluate damage to residual trees after thinning.
- Current trend is to manage for species which are declining due to non-human causes.
- How do we manage for endangered species?
- In managing for species some open habitat is important.
- What is science on creating openings for murrelets, owls, voles etc.?
- Provide habitat for other species other than owls, murrelets, i.e. deer / elk forage.
- Large blocks may be detrimental for some species.
- Concern regarding thinning / cutting old growth forest.
- Biologists should have say on critical habitat not foresters.

Old Growth Forest

Small Group #1

- BLM needs to do something about Barred Owl.
- Leave never-before cut forests alone.
- Where are old growth age limits coming from? Look at Norm & Jerry science to identify old growth definition that's based on forest structure.
- Old growth should be 200 years and older.
- Old growth / habitat elements need to be combined.
- Social / economic outcome needs to be an element. Need to consider livability.
- Define old growth based on literature.
- Native / un-cut forests must be protected. Only small amount left -- serves as scientific basis.

- Define native forests / what's never been cut. Disclose how much native forest will be left.
- Put in trails in older forests to charge money to generate revenue for BLM. Generating revenue from recreation = economic benefit.
- Important to remember wilderness areas that won't be cut.

Small Group #2

- What is old growth? Is it an age or an intrinsic metric?
- How do we determine old growth?
- Look at long-term benefits.
- Don't have one definition of old growth.
- Old growth is needed for wildlife species.

2) What other factors are of great interest to you? What's missing?

Small Group #1

- Consider more salvage after fires to combat disease spread.
- More environmental assessment on air quality, energy use, carbon storage.
- Incorporate more human / community needs into plan.
- Northern Spotted Owls are using Biscuit Fire Area.

Small Group #2

- Some roads could be closed if they are small.
- Experience – biodiversity essential for recreational experience.
- Address economic impacts of recreation.
- Recreation needs transportation infrastructure.
- Analyze unintended effects as a result of proposed management scenarios. Need a long-term approach.

3) Do you have any other comments regarding the RMPs for Western Oregon?

Small Group #1

- Concerned about road closures -want open roads. Not clear justifications for road closures that do occur.
- Take input / direction seriously.
- No mechanism for complaints to be aired and dealt with.
- Are we complying with Federal Coastal Zone Management Act?
- Road closures are a public safety concern. Need roads to complete search / rescue, firefighting, etc.
- Work closely with jurisdictions / other government agencies to oversee road closures. Form committee to regulate road closures. Federal Coordination Policy.
- Would like more involvement in projects. BLM should invest more in listening to public.
- Need opportunities to have open dialogue with BLM. Need more public meetings to get input.
- Work with local group / environmental groups to figure out best course for the elements.

- Follow the law and have coordination with local communities.
- Economics is guiding the plan too much.
- Seek expedited authority to trade lands for wildlife values.
- Roads are closing in by themselves / naturally. Unmaintained roads cause resource damage. Need active management to roads open.

Small Group #2

- Mining district involvement?
- Manage for carbon sink.
- How is Wyden's proposed legislation being addressed?
- Counties should have say in management – be part of process.

C. Input Sheets

Seven participants completed the input form.

Are there other options for these Key Elements that we should consider?

Element One: Sustainable Timber

- Clearly define “sustainable” and back up with scientific data or change terms.
- Timber needs to be managed according to its statutory mandate. O&C and CBWR should be differentiated and treated accordingly.
- We should harvest timber to help our economy, create healthy forests, replant logically and think about the future of our children who will inherit this land.
- What is being sustained? Jobs, timber, species, water? Sustained yield or maximum sustained yield? Slippery terms – make clearer. Why only down to 30%? Should consider more options.
- Need landscape process for specific areas – a management strategy that might work for Coos might not work for Curry or Jackson.
- Need to include regeneration harvest (seed tree, shelter wood, clearcut) in this plan. Not just thinning.

Element Two: Clean Water and Healthy Fish

- Clear cuts and herbicide/pesticide use can cause damage to fish habitat and compromise water quality, etc. Herbicide use near drinking water sources should be banned.
- Buffers should be scaled to fit the areas protected.
- Buffer zones, keep the chemicals out.
- Use science from peer reviewed journals. This is well established science at this point. Baseline and monitoring for salmon population.
- Critical and important – need to look at fish habitat for buffer zones that are watershed specific.
- Buffer strip width need to include results of the latest research. Refer to Watersheds Research Cooperative – the seminar on results was last spring.

Element Three: Habitat for Owls and other Wildlife

- Ask for help from local environmental and science-based groups instead of trying to reinvent the wheel internally. Specifically re-assess Northern Spotted Owl / Barred Owl habitat noting that when Northern Spotted Owls have been displaced, the critical habitat is actually being cut.
- Consider entire ecosystem.
- Sometimes in our zeal and efforts to protect a certain species we actually end up hurting others (i.e. seals which gobble up huge amounts of salmon). Need to use common sense.
- This is emotional for people. No more logging at all in the owl critical habitat.
- Combine Elements Three and Four.
- Need to strongly consider affects of Barred Owls on Spotted Owls versus timber harvest. Need to consider large populations of Marbled Murrelets in Alaska which should be considered endangered species determination.

Element Four: Old Growth Forest

- Again, clear definitions, recognizing site and area-specific factors. Include native forests in planning and conversation. This is the only place to learn how undisturbed forests function.
- Definition of old growth?
- Long-term protection.
- I like them.
- Don't cut never before logged forest, please.
- Need to consider Jerry Franklin's research publication on the definition of old growth.

There are many other factors that BLM will be considered in developing this RMP. What other factors are of great interest to you?

- BLM, like other public and tribal land managers, should be setting aside large blocks for Big Foot habitat. Connectivity of habitat is critical to Big Foot's survival. We need lots of little Big Feet in order to sustain the species.
- Recreation.
- Economic / social health of counties involved.
- Need a broader picture. Include: economic/employment impact; societal impact; and regional impacts.
- Do not create forest fire dangers. Keep the roads open and clear. Let locals harvest the dead timber for firewood log in such a way to protect the forest from some of those huge fires that have done so much damage.
- Science-based management with techniques from peer reviewed journals. Not grey literature. More community events, discussions, opportunities to get involved.
- Add Economic and Revenue for Community Security and Livability.
- Need management to keep roads from closing by brush growth and other factors.

Any other comments regarding the RMPs for Western Oregon?

- Recreation provides way more employment and profit than the timber industry. Modernize. Educate. Environmental protection goals. Long-term. Economic studies.
- Thanks!

4. LOCATION: ROSEBURG

Date: December 18, 2013

Attendance: 40

A. Plenary Q/A

Observation: key elements limit the scope of alternatives, especially large block reserves and old growth outside of large blocks.

Will Congressional legislation make this all moot?

A: BLM is in the middle of a planning process that we need to finish based on current directives. If the legislation were to pass, then that would be a new directive that we would follow. But if legislation stops and nothing happened, we would not have plan. BLM wants an updated plan ASAP.

Why aren't all parts of Purpose and Need reflected in key elements, specifically recreation?

A: Recreation is identified in the P&N, however, not as a "key element" for this outreach session because we are still developing preliminary approaches to recreation. It will be included in the RMP as a major feature of each alternative, and the alternatives will differ in their approaches to providing recreation opportunities.

Is there consideration for global climate change in the alternatives?

A: Yes, it is being considered.

Coordination with Coquille Tribe shouldn't it be management of Coquille Tribal Lands with BLM land and not the reverse.

A. We are coordinating with the Tribe to meet the mandate that Coquille Forest be managed consistent with the plans for the nearby and adjacent Federal lands.

How will the Coast connector gas pipeline affect the RMP?

A. It will be assessed within the cumulative effects analysis found in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Will any O&C lands be given to Indians?

A. Only Congress has the power to transfer federal lands to a tribe.

B. Small Group Discussion

In this session, three small groups were convened. Input is organized by question.

1) Are there other options for the Key Elements that BLM should consider?

Sustainable Timber

Small Group #1

- The primary objective for this plan should be increasing fire resiliency. Try to mimic fire.
- Active management to reduce fuel build up should be more heavily weighted than sustained yield. This is urgent.

- 50% retention would be preferable.
- We should remove 50% of trees to increase fire resistance at a stand level, although this could negatively influence species composition.
- Instead of making rules, let experts do their jobs.
- Renewed clear-cutting is a non-starter. Overcutting caused environmental degradation.
- Consider past management history and landscape view when designing alternatives.
- Let desired outcomes / trajectories guide project design rather than pre-defined targets.
- We need to increase harvesting, done in a sustainable manner, to support jobs and public services.
- Keep roads open.
- What percentage of the land are we managing for sustained yield? 50, 60, 75, 100%?
- Shoot for 100% timber management on O&C lands. More important than old growth.
- Evaluate BLM's contribution to employment, income, multiplier effect. Related to cut levels.
- Evaluate revenue to counties from BLM receipts.

Small Group #2

- Current practices are sustainable.
- Definition of sustainable?
- Sustained yield of all historical size classes.
- Clear-cutting is sustainable.
- Clear-cutting not sustainable.
- Mimic historical habitats.
- Ensuring land (soil) can sustain productivity.
- Clear-cutting is similar to fire (historical).
- Sustainable yield, managed forest not overcrowded.
- Clear-cutting is contentious.
- Allow non-commercial material to remain for nutrients and erosion.
- Manage for all species of trees.
- Apply different management regimes for unique parameters of land.
- Ground truth the land.
- Variable retention that fits the landscape.
- Maintain sustainable production.
- Base harvest on site criteria.
- Uneven age harvest model.
- Harvest burned commercial material in a timely manner and re-plant quickly.
- Manage and harvest based on market conditions.
- Focus on already treated areas. Leave old forest alone.

Small Group #3

- Focus on the revenue generation aspect of sustainable timber for the counties. Should be revenue positive for counties.
- Regeneration in smaller areas vs. thinning.
- Clear definition of sustainable harvest is needed.
- Sustained for perpetuity or sustained yield?
- Annual growth vs. harvest level?
- Consider of variety of management strategies based on ground conditions.
- Manage like timber companies.
- Overcutting has impacted fisheries.
- Sustainable harvest ties to sustainable ecosystems.
- Thinning is not sustainable.
- What's the economic purpose of sustained yield?
- Cut what is possible while supporting surrounding silviculture.
- Must maintain balance with other key elements; sustainable timber should not be overriding.
- Reconsider interpretation of O&C Act to provide 500 mmbf – 1200 mmbf.
- Jobs are central.
- Recreation is a key component.
- Recovery and salvage should be included.
- Both volume and income for counties are important.
- What is sustainable?
- Have we looked at other regions to evaluate impacts of clear-cutting?

Clean Water and Healthy Fish

Small Group #1

- Look at applying Oregon Forest Practices Act on these O&C lands. Difference of opinion on how this would impact fish / wildlife.
- Bring NMFS / USFWS into a proactive role in the design of alternatives.
- Engage watershed councils on designing riparian management alternatives.
- Delay would be bad. Let's not wait for more data to act / move forward.
- Allow active management in riparian areas and don't call them reserves.
- Managing for fire resiliency is also very important in riparian areas. – Disagreement on removing dead trees / downed wood. Habitat vs. fuels.
- Concentrate riparian restoration where BLM lands have highest potential to improve conditions. Recognize varying ownerships within watersheds.

Small Group #2

- Fish science should be used in managing fisheries / water.
- Take into account checkerboard ownership in management.
- Make up for private impacts.
- Manage forest for fish.

- Buffers
- Springs and wetlands
- Wood in streams
- Concern with chemical use's cumulative effects on private lands.
- Inter-relation to private land management.
- Water temperature, shade management are key considerations.
- Take into account the impacts of previous streamside management.
- Manage for species diversity.
- Retain trees to provide shade, lower water temperatures.
- Nutrient inputs.
- Barriers to fish.
- Additional riparian widths may not gain value.
- Coordinate with adjacent landowners; provide incentives.
- Trade lands to consolidate ownerships to meet environmental goals.

Small Group #3

- Recognize the jobs available in industries other than timber, i.e. recreation and fisheries.
- More restoration on BLM lands.
- Managing restoration on BLM lands.
- Managing watersheds in checkerboard ownership is difficult.
- Block up watershed ownerships – important habitats, identify high quality habitats.
- Improve Oregon Forest Practices Act.
- Work with private landowners to manage to national standards.
- Maintain road infrastructure and remove where not needed.
- Find funding to maintain roads.
- Don't manage roads by closing off public access.
- Need the ability to manage roads tied to timber harvest.
- Prioritize fish efforts in areas of concentrated ownership and where there's ability to influence habitat.
- Criteria for developing alternatives should be meeting requirements of laws.
- Identify that drinking water is affected by forest management.
- Establish monetary value for drinking water.
- Balance is not subjective but defined by law.

Habitat for Owls and Other Wildlife

Small Group #1

- Provide connected, well spaced corridors between clusters.
- Provide a variety of habitat types – not just Spotted Owl / Murrelets. Also benefit game species. Timber harvest benefits some species.
- Instead of managing clusters just manage owls/ murrelets like all other species.

- Increase harvesting rather than analysis- paralysis.
- Active management to accomplish broad suite of objectives.
- Cutting old growth is a non-starter.

Small Group #2

- Shoot Barred Owls.
- Extinction is natural.
- Habitat value is size dependent.
- Be realistic in levels of effort.
 - Historical levels
 - Other factors affect survival besides habitat
- SPP demise are human caused but we may be able to recover them. Better stewards.
- Focus on what we can control
 - Barred Owl
 - Existing old growth forests
- Consider private land impacts.
- The onus for Marbled Murrelet conservation is on BLM.
- Murrelets are habitat specialists.
- Spotted Owl is an indicator of greater ecosystem health.
- Habitat clusters and corridors are important and need to be designed to reflect differing ownership.

Small Group #3

- Species declines are indicative of imbalance in current management.
- Must manage for habitat of endangered species.
- Manage according to best science regarding clusters of habitat.
- Single species management is overemphasized.
- Keep focus at ecosystem level.
- Analyze situation with and without Barred Owls control.
- Spotted Owl is an indicator species.

Old Growth Forest

Small Group #2

- Very happy that this is a key factor.
- Support for protecting old growth as part of sustaining overall ecosystems.
- 120 years is valid defining age.
- Age criteria is difficult. Old growth is an unharvested stand.
- How to measure value at stand level and further downstream.
- Can harvest and still maintain old growth.
- Diversity is key. Current stand sizes have no diversity.
- Flexibility in age definition based upon location / structure.

- Focus on RSBG as specific old growth habitat and south.
- Value of non-industrial, private property adjacent to BLM old growth and predictable management.
- Old growth preservation also sustains unknown cultural sites.

Small Group #3

- Old growth forests are DNA reservoirs that may be critical for adaptability.
- Publicly acknowledge limitations of O&C Act for preservation of old growth.
- Aren't old growth and owl habit synonymous?
- Define what old growth is and recognize that it becomes decadent at some point.
- Define by site class.
- Old growth forests are resilient to fire.
- Old growth forests retain water and release slowly and control floods.
- Protecting old growth is not within legal mandates.
- How should BLM define old growth?
- Always maintain some level of old growth.

2) What other factors are of great interest to you? What's missing?

Small Group #2

- More focus on chemicals, soils and runoff.
- Recreation – don't shut down public lands.
 - Public access
 - Leave roads open
 - Recreation
- Value added management – manage resources for socioeconomic.
- Restrict unauthorized uses to protect land.
- Provide all types of recreation.
- Set aside appropriate locations for different recreation types.
- Analysis of private management in public analysis.
- Third party, public, multi-disciplinary monitoring.
- Focus on accountability, transparency in management.

3) Do you have any other comments regarding the RMPs for Western Oregon?

Small Group #3

- Diamond Lake still has problems.
- Trade lands in order to be able to manage watersheds successfully.
- Recognize appetite for wood products.
- Old growth is important for recreation.
- Recreation should be a focus.
- Recreational opportunities tied to quality of life and economics of area.

- Why is so much land in Oregon managed by the federal government?
- Where is the funding for restoration?
- We should salvage dead wood or it will burn again. Disagreement on this.
- What statutory requirement do we have to protect old growth?
- Are the key elements in any order of priority?

C. Input Sheets

Eighteen participants completed the input form.

Are there other options for these Key Elements that we should consider?

Element One: Sustainable Timber

- Need to be truly sustainable.
- Is important as one of the elements but is not the most important element. Cut no more than can be generated in a year, treat each micro-ecosystem uniquely not cookie cutter.
- Lots of science refutes that clear-cutting mimics fire. Use stand history not plant associations to guide future management. Moist and dry forest designation does not capture the complexity of BLM forests.
- Roseburg BLM has more Old Growth than most districts. Should focus timber production on BLM Districts that have been more heavily cut in the past. Save Roseburg for habitat.
- Focus on preservation over harvesting. Find creative ways to make up for revenue shortages. Repeal laws requiring harvest.
- Please consider keeping counties in revenue. Volume and income are important to counties.
- Really appreciate the emphasis on O&C Act and acknowledgement of timber as key element. Don't forget to emphasize revenue generation aspect of O&C Act.
- BLM field staff needs training to understand the O&C Act. This is lacking in the regions and creating community friction. This needs to include recreation staff, as recreation programs often impact O&C obligations.

Element Two: Clean Water and Healthy Fish

- Primary objective – restore Salmon habitat.
- Roads are one of the greatest hazards to water quality. Fisheries are degraded. Riparian areas are critical to healthy clean water. An important element and should not be sacrificed to cut timber required.
- Inventory the whole landscape regardless of ownership to determine cumulative impacts on fish.
- No use of chemicals. Larger buffer zones than required.
- Why not “trade” lands (O&C) with private industry to help keep water and fisheries as a whole system.
- Fund deferred maintenance of roads federally to address fish blockages, sedimentation and landslide prevention.
- Fund transportation infrastructure and address deferred maintenance concerns by increasing federal funding exclusively for transportation to address sediment, fish blockages and mass wasting.

Element Three: Habitat for Owls and other Wildlife

- Salmon forestry is good for everything but profits at the mill.
- Management for wildlife habitat is critically important. May be imperative to create Vole boxes that can provide nests.
- Obey ESA law. Use data from SW Oregon not the coast range, eastside, Olympics, etc. Consider whole landscape including private lands.
- Value of wildlife given equal consideration – equal footing to that of economic value. Respecting the rights of nature and its right to exist without human interference and exploitation.
- Consider all options to every species not just one option or one species.
- Single species management.

Element Four: Old Growth Forest

- Old growth has important financial value.
- Are important as DNA genetically banks or reservoir. This forest has DNA that evolved over millennia with characteristics for adapting to global climate change and other changes. Ability to adapt. Retain water through downed woody material.
- Use age of dominant and co-dominant trees to determine stand age not trees from post fire-suppression era. Using average tree ages of multi-cohort stands skews mean age downward artificially. Old growth forests damp the spread of fire – they protect industry tree farms, which recent fires show are the most flammable stands on the landscape. Define using GTR PNW 447 Spies, et al. Consider size rather than age. Size is more important to wildlife and much easier and cheaper to measure. Consider whole landscape including private lands.
- Old growth forests should be given more criteria than age of trees. Untouched land should be a qualifier and remain untouched.
- Make sure you study the whole area around the forest. Is old growth useful for the area?
- Base on science and O&C Act allowances, legally what does the '37 Act say?

There are many other factors that BLM will be considered in developing this RMP. What other factors are of great interest to you?

- Incentives for industry to cooperate. Better relations with adjacent non-industrial landowners.
- Old growth should be defined by the species it supports... Voles, Northern Flying Squirrels, Northern Spotted Owls.
- Use landscape-level analysis before designing. Site-specific actions. Determine historic range of variability at stand and landscape levels and manage toward the mean of stand types and distribution.
- Preservation of the land. Purity, pristine. A new paradigm is needed – one based on respect of all life with money as the lowest priority. Preservation vs. harvesting – other ways to generate income.
- Do not allow the loudest voices to get their way. Many of us do not have the expertise to voice opinions nor want to get into arguments with others.
- Please consider opening several areas of the Oregon Dunes to off road recreation such as North Spit of Coos River.
- State BLM staff is unfamiliar with O&C regulations and need training. Consider developing an onboarding program for all Oregon staff that explains the O&C Act and how it relates to FLPMA. This is especially important for higher level staff transferring from out of state, consider review of court rulings at a minimum and solicitor general opinions.

- Failure to remove the full growth occurring on an annual basis results in the accumulation of biomass on the land base which will either be wasted or will burn and produce not only loss of revenue but site-specific damage from high intensity fire.

Any other comments regarding the RMPs for Western Oregon?

- Think of monetary values beyond cash for logs.
- Wyden legislation trumps all of this. Design management actions to stay within the sizes and intensities of historic disturbance processes. Clear-cutting is almost always beyond the extremes of historic range of variability.
- Recreation is so important to our economy – fish, timber – everyone needs to work together.
- We want the North Spit of Coos Bay re-opened seasonally. The open sand should be able to open to play on.
- Please consider one species management such as sea lions on Oregon Coast (as one).
- BLM over emphasizes recreational access and programs above needs of fish, wildlife and timber.

ATTACHMENTS

- Agenda (sample)
- Miscellaneous Comments:
 - John Zigler & Cathy Edwards (Medford)
 - Trenor Scott (Medford)
 - Ron Sadler (Coos Bay)
 - Richard Chasm (Roseburg)