
Chapter 4 – Consultation and Coordination

Summary of Notable Changes from the Draft RMP/EIS

Chapter 4 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS has—

- Updated the description of public involvement and cooperator meetings;
- Added a summary of the comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS;
- Added a discussion of the protest process; and
- Added a discussion of the Governor’s consistency review.

Introduction

This chapter describes the public involvement and collaboration that occurred during the preparation of this Proposed RMP/Final EIS. That collaboration includes government-to-government relationships with Tribes, formal cooperators in the planning process, and consultation with Federal and State agencies. This chapter also includes a list of staff involved in the RMPs for Western Oregon.

Public Involvement

Formal scoping for the RMPs began with the publication of the Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on March 9, 2012 (77 FR 14414). The BLM initially requested that the public submit comments in response to the Notice of Intent by July 5, 2012. The BLM continued to accept public scoping comments for an additional 90 days. By October 5, 2012, the BLM had received 584 comment letters. During the scoping period, the BLM held public meetings in Medford, Grants Pass, Klamath Falls, Salem, Springfield, Coos Bay, Roseburg, and Portland.¹⁵⁹ At each of these meetings, the BLM provided a brief overview of the planning process and a list of questions to prompt feedback, and then opened the meeting for discussion. The BLM prepared a scoping report, which contains a summary of this scoping process. The scoping report and other scoping documents are available at <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/scoping.php>.

During the winter of 2013, the BLM initiated a multi-phase outreach strategy to engage the public specifically on recreation management issues. The BLM sought to gain a better understanding of the social values associated with recreational users across western Oregon. This strategy included an interactive website and four regional workshops in Medford, Roseburg, Springfield, and Portland. The regional workshops included the participation of the National Park Service-Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance program, the Association of O&C Counties, the Outdoor Alliance, Travel Oregon, the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and the Mazamas. The BLM designed this recreation outreach to answer planning questions, collect quantitative and qualitative data specific to recreation management area delineation, and to understand better the role, value, and importance that recreation plays within each planning region. Outreach also yielded data related to public demand for specific types of recreation activities, experiences, beneficial outcomes, and the desired character of BLM-administered recreation settings. A Recreation key findings report contains a summary of the results of this outreach effort and is available at <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/key-findings.pdf>.

¹⁵⁹ The BLM has listed the cities in this chapter in order by meeting date.

In June of 2013, the BLM released the Purpose and Need Statement for the RMPs for Western Oregon. While this is not a typical step in the planning process, the BLM shared the Purpose and Need Statement earlier than usual in order to augment dialogue on the direction of the planning process. The Purpose and Need Statement is available at <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/purpose.pdf>.

In August of 2013, the BLM released the Analysis of the Management Situation for the RMPs for Western Oregon (USDI BLM 2013). The BLM managers use the Analysis of the Management Situation as a snapshot to understand the status of the BLM resources and management opportunities in western Oregon, and the BLM shared this document for informational purposes. The Analysis of the Management Situation is available at <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/ams-rmps-western-oregon.pdf>.

During December of 2013, the BLM conducted four community listening sessions on elements of the RMP. The BLM held public meetings in Corvallis, Medford, Coos Bay, and Roseburg. The community listening sessions included BLM updates on the planning process, and attendees had a chance to share their input with the BLM and each other through small group discussions. A report (USDI BLM 2014a) on the community listening sessions is available at <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/comm-listen-report.pdf>.

On February 24, 2014, the BLM released the Planning Criteria (USDI BLM 2014b), which provided an in-depth look at guidance, policy, analytical methodology, and preliminary alternatives. The comment period for the Planning Criteria continued until March 31, 2014. The BLM received approximately 3,000 comments during this comment period. During March 2014, the BLM conducted seven public meetings about the Planning Criteria and the preliminary alternatives. The BLM held public meetings in Portland, Springfield, Salem, Roseburg, Coos Bay, Medford, and Klamath Falls. The BLM also held an additional public meeting in Roseburg with invited elected officials. The Planning Criteria is available at <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/rmp-criteria.pdf>.

Additionally, the BLM has provided information to the public through various digital media outlets, including the BLM's public website, Twitter, and Facebook. The public can send inquiries to the agency at any time through a publicly available email address, BLM_OR_RMPs_WesternOregon@blm.gov.

On April 24, 2015, the BLM released the Draft RMP/EIS, announcing, at that time, a 90-day comment period that would conclude on July 23, 2015. On July 13, 2015, the BLM extended the comment period on the Draft RMP/EIS until August 21, 2015. During the comment period, the BLM held 17 scheduled public meetings in May and June of 2015. These meetings included open houses in Roseburg, Springfield, Salem, Klamath Falls, Medford, Coos Bay, and Portland. These public meetings also included workshops on socioeconomics in Salem and Roseburg, workshops on recreation in Roseburg, Grants Pass, Salem, and Springfield, workshops on forest management and wildlife in Salem and Medford, and a workshop on riparian management in Springfield. The BLM also held a public meeting with an invitation for elected officials in Salem. The BLM announced these public meetings through the BLM website and news releases. The Report on Public Outreach Sessions is available at http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/Public_Outreach_Report_Aug2015.pdf.

The BLM received approximately 4,500 comments on the Draft RMP/EIS during the comment period. The BLM has compiled, analyzed, and summarized all comments received during the comment period on the Draft RMP/EIS. **Appendix W** presents a summary of substantive comments the BLM received during the comment period and provides a response indicating how the BLM modified the document or why the comment did not warrant a change to the document. Comment letters submitted during the comment period are available at <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/comments.php>.

List of Recipients of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS

The BLM will distribute the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to a mailing list of those agencies, organizations, Tribes, and individuals that have requested copies. This mailing list, which includes approximately 750 mailings of the document, is incorporated here by reference (USDI BLM 2016b).

Protest Process

Pursuant to BLM's planning regulations at 43 CFR 1610.5-2, any person who participated in the planning process for this Proposed RMP and has an interest which is or may be adversely affected by the planning decisions may protest approval of the planning decisions within 30 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. Protests must comply with the requirements described in the BLM's planning regulations at 43 CFR 1610.5-2. Interested parties should take care to document all relevant facts. As much as possible, specific planning documents or available planning records (e.g., meeting minutes or summaries, and correspondence) should be referenced or cited.

Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular or overnight mail postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the emailed protest as an advance copy and will afford it full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM with such advance notification, please direct emailed protests to the attention of the BLM protest coordinator at protest@blm.gov.

All protests, including the follow-up letter (if emailing), must be in writing and mailed to one of the following addresses:

Regular Mail:

Director (210)
Attn: Protest Coordinator
P.O. Box 71383
Washington, D.C. 20024-1383

Overnight Delivery:

Director (210)
Attn: Protest Coordinator
20 M Street SE, Room 2134LM
Washington, D.C. 20003

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, be advised that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your protest to withhold from public review your personal identifying information, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

The BLM Director will make every attempt to render a decision on each protest promptly. The decision will be in writing and will be sent to the protesting party by certified mail, return receipt requested. The decision of the BLM Director shall be the final decision of the Department of the Interior.

Upon resolution of all land use plan protests, the BLM will issue two Records of Decision/Approved RMPs (RODs/RMPs). The Approved RODs/RMPs will be mailed to parties who have requested hard copies or email notifications the documents are available online.

Government-to-Government Relationships

Federally recognized Tribes have a unique relationship with the Federal government in that they are sovereign nations and retain inherent powers of self-government. They interact with the United States on a government-to-government level.

When preparing RMPs, the BLM consults with Tribes to provide Tribes with an opportunity to identify any issues or concerns that Tribes may have with the management of lands and resources in the decision area; to identify places of religious or cultural significance (and if any issues exist with access to places needed for the practice of traditional religions); and whether there are other Indian individuals or traditional cultural leaders who the BLM should also contact.

There are nine federally recognized Tribes located within, or that have interests within, the planning area:

- The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde: www.grandronde.org
- The Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians: www.ctsi.nsn.us
- The Coquille Indian Tribe: www.coquilletribe.org
- The Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians: www.ctclusi.org
- The Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs: www.warmsprings.com
- The Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians: www.cowcreek.com
- The Klamath Tribes: www.klamathtribes.org
- The Quartz Valley Indian Reservation: www.qvir.com
- The Karuk Tribe: www.karuk.us

The BLM invited all of the above federally recognized Tribes to be formal cooperators in the RMP revisions because of their special expertise. The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, the Coquille Indian Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and the Klamath Tribes are formal cooperators in the RMP revisions, in addition to their government-to-government status. These Tribes along with other agencies that participated as formal cooperators made up the Cooperating Agencies Advisory Group (CAAG). The Tribal representatives along with BLM staff formed a Tribal Working Group. Details of the CAAG and working groups are in the following section “Formal Cooperators.”

In 2013, the BLM offered all Tribes within, or that have interests within, the planning area an opportunity to schedule individual Tribal listening sessions. The BLM met with five Tribes on different dates spanning from May 14, 2013, to December 13, 2013. A summary of these listening sessions can be found in **Appendix R** along with biographies and maps for the six Tribes who have participated as formal cooperators in the planning process. These listening sessions and subsequent consultation also served to inform the Tribal Interests section of Chapter 3.

In October 2014, the BLM invited all nine Tribes to consult on the Draft RMP/EIS. Tribes wished to meet after the release of the Draft RMP/EIS. From May 18, 2015, to November 5, 2015, the BLM met with the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, the Coquille Indian Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and the Klamath Tribes. Some Tribes met with the BLM more than once during this timeframe.

In addition to formal consultation and participation in the CAAG and the Tribal Working Group, Tribal representatives maintained frequent email and phone dialogue with BLM managers and the BLM Tribal liaison.

The Coquille Indian Tribe has a representative on the Westside Steering Committee, as noted below, in addition to their government-to-government relationship and their role as a formal cooperator. The BLM has also met regularly with the Coquille Indian Tribe to facilitate open and recurring communication. The Coquille Indian Tribe is directly engaged in the planning process, because the management of the Coquille Forest is subject by law (25 U.S.C. 715c(d)) to the standards and guidelines of forest plans for adjacent or nearby Federal forestlands. Title V of the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-208) included the creation of the Coquille Forest to be held in trust for the benefit of the

Coquille Indian Tribe. The Act states that the Coquille Forest shall be managed “under applicable State and Federal forestry and environmental protection laws, and subject to critical habitat designations under the Endangered Species Act, and subject to the standards and guidelines of Federal forest plans on adjacent or nearby Federal lands, now and in the future.” This Act also requires the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to take the Coquille Forest lands into trust for the benefit of the Coquille Indian Tribe. For the purposes of interpreting Title V of this Act, the management direction that will be described within the eventual RMP is synonymous with the “standards and guidelines” referenced in this Act.

Formal Cooperators

The FLPMA and NEPA provide direction regarding the coordination and cooperation of Federal agencies with other agencies and local and state governments and tribes. The FLPMA specifically emphasizes the need to ensure coordination and consistency of the BLM’s proposed actions with the plans and policies of other relevant jurisdictions. The Council on Environmental Quality’s regulations for implementing NEPA specifically requires cooperative relationships between lead and cooperating agencies.

Cooperating agency status provides a formal framework for governmental units (including local, State, Federal, and Tribal) to engage in active collaboration with a lead Federal agency to implement requirements of NEPA. For these RMP revisions, the BLM has worked with cooperators from many agencies. With all formal cooperators, the BLM has signed a memorandum of understanding, identifying the roles and responsibilities of the BLM and the cooperating agency in the planning process. **Table 4-1** contains a list of the formal cooperators for these RMP revisions.

Table 4-1. Formal cooperators

Government Type	Cooperator
County Governments*	Benton County
	Clackamas County
	Columbia County
	Coos County
	Curry County
	Douglas County
	Klamath County
	Lane County
	Lincoln County
	Linn County
	Marion County
	Multnomah County
	Polk County
	Tillamook County
	Washington County
Yamhill County	
State Government	State of Oregon [†]
Federal Government	Environmental Protection Agency
	National Marine Fisheries Service
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
	U.S. Forest Service
Tribes	Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians
	Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
	Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
	Coquille Indian Tribe
	Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians
	Klamath Tribes

* With the exception of Benton County, all of the listed counties have authorized the Association of O&C Counties to act as the counties' agent and representative in their role as cooperating agencies in this planning process. Occasionally, some counties represented by the Association of O&C Counties have had a county commissioner participate in the activities of the planning process. When that has happened, the county commissioner, rather than the Association of O&C Counties, has represented the county.

[†] Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Department of Forestry are the Oregon State agencies actively engaged in the planning process.

Working through a robust engagement process with neutral facilitation, the cooperators have provided expertise on much of the subject matter the BLM is addressing in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, as well as advice based on experience with similar planning efforts. The cooperators have provided feedback on public outreach sessions, data sources and analytical methods, and components of the alternatives. They have provided oral and written feedback and ideas throughout the process of developing the Draft RMP/EIS and Proposed RMP/Final EIS. DS Consulting, working through Oregon Consensus, has facilitated all meetings of the Cooperating Agency Advisory Group and the five individual working groups described below.

The Cooperating Agency Advisory Group first met in the summer of 2012, when the facilitators led them through an orientation to the cooperating agency task and assisted the group in defining its desired outcomes. In the fall and winter of 2012, the Cooperating Agency Advisory Group met five times to provide and review RMP scoping comments and to discuss the RMP process. They also met three times

to provide comments and review documents developed by the BLM for the planning effort, including the purpose and need for action and the planning criteria, in addition to providing written comments on the BLM's methodology for analyzing the effects of the alternatives. The Cooperating Agency Advisory Group met once to provide feedback on the public meetings held in 2013 and 2014. The BLM conducted a rehearsal of the public meetings with the Cooperating Agency Advisory Group, which provided feedback on the content and format, leading the BLM to make improvements to the outreach sessions. The Cooperating Agency Advisory Group also met five times to discuss the results of the analysis and to provide feedback to the BLM on the identification of a preferred alternative. After the publication of Draft RMP/EIS, the Cooperating Agency Advisory Group met twice to provide feedback to the BLM on the development of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

In addition to meeting as a full group periodically throughout the development of the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, the Cooperating Agency Advisory Group also created five working groups in the winter of 2013 in order to facilitate a more detailed level of engagement with the BLM. These groups focused, respectively, on the following topics: aquatics, outreach, terrestrial, socio-economics, and Tribal issues.

The Aquatics Working Group met six times during the development of the Draft RMP/EIS. The BLM updated the group on the status of alternative development. The working group provided comments on the development of the riparian management strategies and the methodology for analyzing impacts of the alternatives on aquatic habitat and water quality.

The Outreach Working Group met six times during the development of the Draft RMP/EIS. The group discussed outreach planning and goals and provided input on the outreach timeline. During the winter of 2013, they met to revisit ideas for outreach during the planning criteria comment period.

The Terrestrial Working Group met five times during the development of the Draft RMP/EIS. The BLM updated this group on the development of the terrestrial components of the alternatives (e.g., alternative approaches for the large block reserve design). The group reviewed and provided input on the methodology for analyzing the impacts of the alternatives on terrestrial resources and met to discuss and provide feedback on components of the alternatives related to timber harvest, northern spotted owl conservation, marbled murrelet conservation, and fire and fuels management.

The Socio-Economic Working Group met eight times during the development of the Draft RMP/EIS. This group reviewed and refined the methodology for analyzing the socio-economic analysis of the alternatives, including working with BLM and its contractors on the development of a method to analyze impacts to community capacity and resiliency. Members of this group assisted the BLM in obtaining county economic data and identifying city officials for information-collection interviews.

The Tribal Working Group met seven times during the development of the Draft RMP/EIS. This group provided input on the process by which the BLM conducted Tribal listening sessions and consultation. They also provided input on aspects of the alternatives and analytical methodology that address resources of concern to the Tribes represented in the group. Members of the group also reviewed and provided content for appendices to the Tribal Interests section of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Additionally, the Coquille Indian Tribe, in their capacity as a cooperating agency, suggested to the BLM a riparian strategy. The BLM worked with the Coquille Indian Tribe to develop this suggestion in detail and include it among the alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS, in addition to the riparian strategies developed by the Riparian Technical Team described below.

The BLM district managers and planning personnel have met with individual county commissioners on an ongoing basis to provide updates on progress and key milestones. As noted above, several county governments are formal cooperators in the planning process. While the Association of O&C Counties represents most of the counties at the Cooperating Agency Advisory Group meetings, BLM district managers also maintain relationships with local county representatives.

Documenting Disagreement or Inconsistencies with Cooperating Agencies¹⁶⁰

The Cooperating Agency Advisory Group and its working groups have provided the BLM with a unique opportunity to share the BLM's thinking early in the planning process and for the BLM to hear the ideas and concerns cooperating agencies have with how the BLM has been planning and analyzing thus far. At this point in the process, all cooperators have had numerous opportunities to express their opinions about content and process, and to make suggestions about how the BLM might improve its plan. Largely, most disagreements that have arisen have been resolved through dialogue at meetings of the full group and its work groups. Nearly all cooperators have been positive about the level of engagement and the general direction of the planning process. However, the Association of O&C Counties (which is the designated representative of 15 counties) has continued to express a high level of concern about the BLM's planning process.

Specifically, the Association of O&C Counties continues to assert that the BLM's Purpose and Need statement was fatally flawed by failing to place sustained-yield timber production as the primary purpose of the planning effort. In letters to the BLM Director, State Director, and Project Manager, and at nearly all Cooperating Agency meetings, the Association of O&C Counties representatives have maintained that the BLM should have placed sustained-yield timber production as the primary focus of the planning effort with all other actions required by other laws and treaties falling secondary to that purpose. As a result, the Association of O&C Counties has expressed disagreement with the purpose and need, the planning criteria, and the range of alternatives. The Association of O&C Counties maintains that the O&C Act and legal opinions that have stemmed from its mandate that the BLM should first provide a minimum of 500 million board feet of sustained yield timber harvest per year, then balance all other needs after that has been provided. The Association of O&C Counties and its member counties have stated that, because the BLM has sought to analyze what a balanced approach between the competing laws, treaties, and needs of all cooperating agencies might look like, the BLM has created a range of alternatives that is too narrow to achieve the primary purpose and the level of sustained yield required by law and court decisions.

That said, the Association of O&C Counties continues to attend and actively participate in the Cooperating Agency Advisory Group and its working groups, making certain that all members are aware of this fundamental disagreement and requesting that the BLM broaden the range of alternatives by including the alternative developed in the 2008 Western Oregon Plan Revision (USDI 2008).

Coordination with the Regional Interagency Executive Committee

The Regional Interagency Executive Committee serves as the senior regional entity to assure the prompt, coordinated, and successful implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan at the regional level. The Regional Interagency Executive Committee is composed of regional directors from the various land

¹⁶⁰ This summary documenting disagreement or inconsistencies with cooperating agencies was provided to the BLM by the outside, impartial facilitation team from Oregon Consensus after reviewing meeting summaries and letters from the Cooperating Agency Advisory Group. In their comments on the Draft RMP/EIS, the Association of O&C Counties states that they reject this summary, asserting that it misrepresents their position (**Appendix W**).

management, regulatory, research, and other relevant agencies in the Federal government located in northern California, western Oregon, and western Washington, including the following:

- Army Corps of Engineers
- BLM
- Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Environmental Protection Agency, Western Ecology Research Division
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Forest Service
- U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station
- U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station
- U.S. Geological Survey, Western Research Region
- National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Region
- National Park Service
- Natural Resources Conservation Service

The BLM has coordinated with the Regional Interagency Executive Committee throughout this RMP revision process. As noted in Chapter 1, the BLM has considered the concepts contained in the Framework to Guide Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Land Use Plan Revisions and Amendments (RIEC 2011) in developing the action alternatives for this RMP revision. The BLM met with the Regional Interagency Executive Committee eight times from 2012 to 2016 to provide information and to coordinate on the RMP revision process.

Governor's Consistency Review

Pursuant to BLM's planning regulations at 43 CFR 1610.3–2(e), the BLM has submitted this Proposed RMP to the Governor of Oregon for review. The Governor shall have 60 days in which to identify inconsistencies with State or local plans, policies, or programs and provide recommendations in writing to the BLM. If recommendations of the Governor recommend changes in the Proposed RMP which were not raised during the public participation process, the BLM will provide the public with an opportunity to comment on the recommendations.

Consultation

Endangered Species Act

Before signing a Record of Decision on the RMP revisions, the BLM will complete consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service are conducting these consultations consistent with the final rule amending the incidental take statement provisions of the implementing regulations for Section 7 of the ESA (80 FR 26832–26845). The BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service signed an ESA Consultation Agreement, which identifies responsibilities for each agency and defines the processes, products, actions, timeframe, and expectations for the consultation process. The ESA Consultation Agreement, signed June 18, 2013, is available at <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/esa-consult-agree.pdf>.

As part of this consultation, the BLM has prepared biological assessments of the potential effects of implementing the Proposed RMP. The BLM submitted these biological assessments to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service on February 1, 2016. In these biological assessments, the BLM has described the Proposed RMP, the geographic area addressed by the RMP, and

the manner in which the Proposed RMP would affect threatened, endangered, and proposed species and their designated and proposed critical habitats.

As part of this consultation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service will provide their biological opinions. These biological opinions will include assessments of the status of the species and critical habitats involved, contain reviews of the potential effects of the Proposed RMP on these species and habitats, and provide evaluations of whether the Proposed RMP would be likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species or destroy or adversely modify their critical habitats. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service will prepare separate biological opinions dealing with terrestrial and aquatic species under their respective ESA jurisdiction. Additional information on the biological assessments and biological opinions is available in the ESA Consultation Agreement.

In addition to their role as formal cooperators, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service have met with the BLM repeatedly throughout the RMP revision in preparation for the ESA consultation on the Proposed RMP. As part of that work, and consistent with the ESA Consultation Agreement, the BLM and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have met as a Terrestrial Technical Team in April 2013, September 2013, January 2014, February 2014, and March 2014 to discuss the analytical methodology for evaluating the effects of the alternatives on ESA-listed species and producing analytical information for the biological assessments. The BLM also met directly with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in April 2014 to discuss specifically the forest management approach for northern spotted owl critical habitat in Alternative D considered in the Draft RMP/EIS.

The BLM convened a group including representatives of the National Marine Fisheries Service and Environment Protection Agency in April and May 2013 to develop a strategic proposal for riparian management. The Environmental Protection Agency has participated in these meetings in the capacity of their technical expertise related to water quality. The BLM, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Environmental Protection Agency met as a Riparian Technical Team to develop that strategic proposal in detail to be included among the alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS. DS Consulting facilitated all meetings of the Riparian Technical Team. The Riparian Technical Team met seven times from August 2013 to January 2014 and presented their work to the Cooperating Agency Advisory Group on January 30, 2014. During the preparation of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, the Riparian Technical Team met four times to explore development of the riparian management strategy for the Proposed RMP.

In June 2015, the BLM submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service a conservation assessment, based on the preferred alternative identified in the Draft RMP/EIS. The BLM prepared that conservation assessment to provide the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with early identification of the data and analytical methodology the BLM would use to describe effects in its biological assessment, to ensure that its biological assessment met the needs of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for consultation under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, and to provide the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with an opportunity to provide advice or technical assistance to the BLM on how the eventual Proposed RMP could best contribute to the conservation and recovery of ESA-listed species. On December 17, 2015, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provided the BLM with a conservation review in response to the conservation assessment. As part of that conservation assessment and conservation review process, the BLM met directly with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service repeatedly throughout the summer and fall of 2015 to address the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service advice to the BLM on how the eventual Proposed RMP could best contribute to the conservation and recovery of ESA-listed species.

The BLM met directly with the National Marine Fisheries Service in March 2014, April 2014, and June 2014 to discuss analytical methodology for evaluating the effects of the alternatives on ESA-listed fish

species and producing analytical information for the biological assessments. The BLM met again in December 2014 with the National Marine Fisheries Service, Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to continue discussions on the biological needs of ESA-listed fish species. The BLM conducted an ‘early review’ process with the National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate section 7(a)(2) consultation under the ESA. In this early review process, the BLM provided the National Marine Fisheries Service with early identification of the data and analytical methodology the BLM would use to describe effects in its biological assessment, to ensure that its biological assessment met the needs of the National Marine Fisheries Service for consultation under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, and to provide the National Marine Fisheries Service with an opportunity to provide advice or technical assistance to the BLM on how the eventual Proposed RMP could best contribute to the conservation and recovery of ESA-listed species. The BLM met repeatedly with National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service throughout summer and fall of 2015 to discuss the format and information for the biological assessments for ESA-listed fish species. The BLM has documented the meetings and correspondence of the early review process and that documentation is incorporated here by reference (USDI BLM 2016).

On December 18, 2015, the National Marine Fisheries Service sent the BLM a letter to clarify their comments on the Draft RMP/EIS (USDC NMFS 2015). In that letter, the National Marine Fisheries Service stated that they believe the best available science can support the concepts of an aquatic conservation strategy that they have discussed with the BLM, and that Alternatives A and D provide the building blocks of such a strategy. The National Marine Fisheries Service also identified portions of their comments on the Draft RMP/EIS that were in error and asked that those comments be ignored. That letter is incorporated here by reference.

National Historic Preservation Act

The BLM complies with the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. 300101 *et seq.*) through the State Protocol with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (USDI BLM 2015) as directed by the National Programmatic Agreement (USDI BLM 2012). In accordance with the national Programmatic Agreement and the State Protocol, the BLM sent the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office a letter to initiate consultation on the RMP revision. The BLM did not receive a response to this letter. In the spring of 2015, the BLM sent the Draft RMP/EIS to the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. The BLM did not receive comments from the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office on the Draft RMP/EIS. Upon implementation of the approved RMP, the BLM will consult with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office on Federal undertakings with the potential to effect cultural resources in accordance with the 2015 State Protocol in order to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act.

Water and Air Quality Management

As part of these RMP revisions, the BLM has been concurrently coordinating with various agencies on water and air quality management. The BLM will continue to coordinate with the Environmental Protection Agency and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (the federally designated management agency) on water quality standards and other requirements of the federally designated management agency as authorized by the Clean Water Act. Similarly, the BLM will continue to coordinate with the Environmental Protection Agency, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and U.S. Forest Service when authorizing implementation actions to minimize the impacts of the emissions from prescribed burns.

List of Preparers

Westside Steering Committee

The Westside Steering Committee is comprised of BLM Oregon/Washington Deputy State Director - Division of Resources, the six BLM district managers represented in the RMP revisions, and a representative from the Coquille Indian Tribe. This committee provides leadership and direction to the RMP revisions planning process.

Key Project Staff

An interdisciplinary team of resource specialists and managers from the BLM districts and state office, and contract personnel prepared the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for the RMPs for Western Oregon. **Table 4-2** lists the staff, the organization where each staff member works, and their area of responsibility, followed by brief biographies for each BLM interdisciplinary team member.

Table 4-2. List of key project staff

Name	BLM Office	Area of Responsibility
Michael Allen	Oregon State Office	Management and Program Analyst
Stewart Allen	Oregon State Office	Socioeconomics
Peter Broussard	Coos Bay District	Sustainable Energy
Mark Brown	Oregon State Office	Project Manager
Dan Carpenter	Coos Bay District	Hydrology
Susan Carter	Roseburg District	Rare Plants and Fungi
J. Byron Clayton	Oregon State Office	Lands and Realty
John Colby	Coos Bay District	Hydrology
Lori Crumley	Lakeview District	Grazing and Wild Horses
Craig Ducey	Oregon State Office	Inventory Data Support
Louisa Evers	Oregon State Office	Air Quality and Climate Change
Paul Fyfield	Oregon State Office	Cartography
Eric Greenquist	Oregon State Office	Wildlife – Northern Spotted Owl
Richard Hardt	Oregon State Office	Interdisciplinary Team Leader
Claire Hibler	Salem District	Invasive Species and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Eric Hiebenthal	Oregon State Office	GIS Data Management
Aimee Hoefs	Coos Bay District	Writer, Editor, and Records
Carolina Hooper	Oregon State Office	Vegetation Modeling
Zach Jarrett	Salem District	Recreation, Visual Resource Management, and the National Landscape Conservation System
Racheal Jones	Coos Bay District	Assistant Editor
Craig Kintop	Roseburg District	Forest Management
Sarah Levy	Oregon State Office	Public Affairs Officer
Rex McGraw	Roseburg District	Wildlife – All but the Northern Spotted Owl
Arthur Miller	Oregon State Office	GIS and Data Analysis
Diane Parry	Medford District	Minerals
Heather Partipilo	Coos Bay District	Assistant Editor
Panchita Paulete	Oregon State Office	Associate Interdisciplinary Team Leader
Lauren Pidot	Oregon State Office	Associate Interdisciplinary Team Leader
Cory Sipher	Roseburg District	Fisheries
Dale Stewart	Oregon State Office	Soils
Brian Thauland	Oregon State Office	Roads
Shelli Timmons	Oregon State Office	Management Analyst
Heather Ulrich	Eugene & Salem Districts	Cultural Resources and Tribal Interests
Jena Volpe	Medford District	Fire and Fuels
Abe Wheeler	Roseburg District	Forest Management

Mike Allen – Management and Program Analyst. Mike earned a Bachelor of Science in Wildlife Management at Humboldt State University. Mike started his 38-year career with the BLM as a wildland firefighter on the Lakeview District. That led to wildlife biologist positions in Lakeview and Prineville. He worked 16 years on the Salem District as a Natural Resource Specialist performing wildlife surveys, timber sale preparation, and public outreach. Mike has been a Management and Program Analyst in the Oregon State Office for 4 years.

Stewart Allen – Socioeconomics. Stewart earned a Bachelor of Arts in Mass Communications and a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology at the University of Utah, a Master of Arts in Social/Environmental

Psychology at Claremont Graduate School, and a Ph.D. in Forestry (with a minor in Psychology) at the University of Montana. He has 35 years of experience in the human dimensions of natural resources including 21 years with the Federal Government and 1.5 years with the BLM as Socioeconomic Specialist, a zoned position shared by Oregon/Washington, California, and Alaska.

Peter Broussard – Sustainable Energy. Pete earned a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Southwestern Louisiana. Registered as a professional engineer for 37 years, he currently holds professional engineering licenses in 3 states. Most of his private-sector career has been in the electric utility, gas pipeline, and petroleum industries. His public service includes 8 years in the military as a combat engineer, and 6 years with the BLM as the Engineering Supervisor in the Coos Bay District.

Mark Brown – Project Manager. Mark Brown currently serves as the RMPs for Western Oregon Project Manager in the BLM Oregon State Office. He previously served as the BLM Partnership Coordinator. His Federal career began as a Presidential Management Fellow with the National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service before joining the BLM in 2002. He earned a Master of Environmental Management from Yale University, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, and a Master of Public Administration at Portland State University, Hatfield School of Government.

Dan Carpenter – Hydrology (2012-2015). Dan earned a Bachelor of Science in Soil Conservation from Washington State University. He has worked as a professional hydrologist for the past 36 years with the U.S. Forest Service and the BLM on the Oregon Coast, Western Cascades, and Great Basin in Nevada. At the time of the preparation of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, he was the District Hydrologist in the Coos Bay District. He has since retired from the BLM.

Susan Carter – Rare Plants and Fungi. Susan earned a Bachelor of Arts in Botany and Environmental Biology (double major) from Humboldt State University and has 26 years of experience working as a botanist with the BLM and the U.S. Forest Service. She is currently the District Botanist in the Roseburg District.

J. Byron Clayton – Lands and Realty. Byron earned a Bachelor of Arts in Geography at Appalachian State University and a Master of Science in Geography at Portland State University. He began work for the BLM in 2001 as a student cartographer with the Land Records Team in the Branch of Lands and Minerals. He is currently the Supervisory Geographer of the Land Records Team in the Branch of Geographic Sciences in the BLM Oregon State Office.

John Colby – Hydrology (2016). John earned a Bachelor of Science in Natural Resources and Environmental Studies with an emphasis in Water Resources from the University of Minnesota. For the past 13 years, he has been a hydrologist in the Umpqua Field Office of the Coos Bay District BLM.

Lori Crumley – Grazing and Wild Horses. Lori earned a Bachelor of Science in Range Ecology and a Master of Science in Plant Science at the University of Idaho. She has 8 years of experience working for the Federal Government as a Range Management Specialist. For the last 4 years, she has been a Range Management Specialist in the Lakeview Field Office of the Lakeview District.

Craig Ducey – Inventory Data Support. Craig earned a Bachelor of Science in Botany at the University of Wyoming and a Master of Science in Geography at Portland State University. He has 15 years of experience as a GIS/Remote Sensing Specialist in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Louisa Evers – Air Quality and Climate Change. Louisa earned a Bachelor of Science in Forestry from the University of Tennessee, a Master of Science in Forestry with an emphasis in Fire Ecology from the University of Idaho, and a Ph.D. in Environmental Science with an emphasis in Rangeland Ecology from

Oregon State University. She has 29 years of experience with BLM and the U.S. Forest Service in fuels and fire management, fire ecology, vegetation ecology, and climate change. She is currently the Research Liaison and Climate Change Coordinator in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Paul Fyfield – Cartography. Paul earned a Bachelor of Arts and a Master of Science in Geography at Portland State University. He has worked for the BLM Oregon State Office in Portland since 2001. He is currently a Cartographer in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Eric Greenquist – Wildlife – Northern Spotted Owl. Eric earned a Bachelor of Arts in Biology at the University of Missouri and a Master of Science in Wildlife Ecology at Ohio University. He has worked as a professional wildlife biologist for 38 years, including 35 years with the BLM with the past 23 years in western Oregon. At the time of the preparation of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, he was a wildlife biologist in the BLM Oregon State Office. He has since retired from the BLM.

Richard Hardt – Interdisciplinary Team Leader. Richard earned a Bachelor of Arts in Natural Sciences at the Johns Hopkins University, a Master of Landscape Architecture at Harvard University, and a Ph.D. in Forest Resources at the University of Georgia. He has 21 years of experience working for the BLM and is currently a planner in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Claire Hibler – Invasive Species and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. Claire earned a Bachelor of Science in Forest Management at Oregon State University and a Bachelor of Arts in General Biology at Humboldt State University. Claire is a founding member of, and participates on, the steering committee for the Western Invasives Network, which spans northwest Oregon, part of southwest Washington, and the Columbia River Gorge. She has worked in the Salem District for more than 26 years, serving as the District Botanist since 2001.

Eric Hiebenthal – GIS Data Management. Eric earned a Bachelor of Science in Geography at Oregon State University. He has 19 years of experience with the BLM working with GIS, specializing in GIS Data Management. He is currently a GIS Data Management Specialist in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Aimee Hoefs – Writer, Editor, and Records. Aimee earned a Bachelor of Arts in Molecular Biology at Colgate University. She has worked for the BLM for 20 years and has been a NEPA specialist for the past 8 years. She is formerly the Myrtlewood Field Office Planning and Environmental Coordinator in the Coos Bay District.

Carolina Hooper – Vegetation Modeling Lead. Carolina earned a Bachelor of Science in Forestry at Humboldt State University and a Master of Science in Forestry at Oregon State University. She has worked in forest inventory and planning for the last 21 years with the U.S. Forest Service and the BLM. She is currently a Forester/Resource Information Analyst in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Zach Jarrett – Recreation, Visual Resource Management, and the National Landscape Conservation System. Zach earned a Bachelor of Science in Recreation Resource Management at Oregon State University and a Master of Science in Natural Resource Planning at Humboldt State University. He has 14 years of experience working for the BLM in western Oregon and is currently an outdoor recreation planner in the Oregon State Office working on regional recreation and travel planning projects.

Racheal Jones – Assistant Editor. Racheal earned a Bachelor of Arts in Geography at Western Washington University and a Master of Science degree in Water Science and Management at New Mexico State University. She has 9 years in of experience in planning. She is currently the Planning and Environmental Coordinator for the Myrtlewood Field Office in the Coos Bay District.

Craig Kintop – Forest Management. Craig earned a Bachelor of Science in Forest Resources Management at the University of Minnesota. He has more than 39 years of experience working for the U.S. Forest Service and the BLM and is currently the District Forester/Silviculturist in the Roseburg District.

Sarah Levy – Public Affairs Officer. Sarah earned a Bachelor of Arts at the University of Southern California, and a Master of Science in Natural Resources and Environment at the University of Michigan, School of Natural Resources and Environment. Sarah has 6 years of experience with the U.S. Forest Service working in public affairs, recreation, and research and is currently a Public Affairs Officer in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Rex McGraw – Wildlife. Rex earned a Bachelor of Science and a Master of Science in Wildlife Biology at the University of Montana, Missoula. He has 17 years of experience with the BLM and is currently the District Wildlife Biologist in the Roseburg District.

Arthur Miller – GIS and Data Analysis Lead. Arthur earned a Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts in Geography at Oregon State University. He has over 26 years of experience working with the BLM in Oregon, with an emphasis on the use of geographic information systems for resource and land use planning. He is currently a Geographic Information Specialist in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Diane Parry – Minerals. Diane earned a Bachelor of Arts in Geology at Humboldt State University. She has 29 years of experience as a geologist with the BLM and is currently the Lead Geologist in the Medford District, zoned to the west side of Oregon.

Heather Partipilo – Assistant Editor. Heather earned a Bachelor of Science in Botany and Plant Pathology and a Master of Science in Botany and Plant Pathology from Oregon State University. She has worked on the Lakeview District as a botanist and is currently a Planning and Environmental Coordinator in the Umpqua Field Office of the Coos Bay District.

Panchita Paulete – Associate Interdisciplinary Team Leader (2015 – 2016). Panchita has a Bachelor of Arts in Professional Writing and Rhetoric from Elon University and a Master of Science in Forestry from Michigan Technological University. She has more than 9 years of experience as a NEPA specialist and is currently a planner in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Lauren Pidot – Associate Interdisciplinary Team Leader (2013 – 2014). Lauren earned a Bachelor of Arts in Government at Wesleyan University and a Master of Science in Natural Resource Policy at the University of Michigan. She has over 7 years of experience with the BLM and is currently a planner in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Cory Sipher – Fisheries. Cory earned a Bachelor of Science in Biology at the State University of New York at Cortland and a Master of Science in Fishery Biology at Colorado State University. Cory has been with the BLM for 13 years, starting his career as a Fisheries Biologist in the South River Field Office of the Roseburg District. He has served as the District Fisheries Biologist in the Roseburg District since 2012.

Dale Stewart – Soils. Dale earned a Bachelor of Science in Forestry and a Master of Science in Biological Sciences at Michigan Technological University. He has over 36 years of experience working in the forestry, soil, and hydrology disciplines with the BLM and U.S. Forest Service in Oregon. He is currently the Soil, Water, and Air Program Lead in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Brian Thauland – Roads. Brian earned a Bachelor of Science in Forest Management at Iowa State University. He has 37 years of experience with the BLM in forest engineering and currently provides transportation program support in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Shelli Timmons – Management Analyst (2012 – 2014). Shelli earned a Bachelor of Arts in Business Communication at the University of Phoenix. Shelli has over 15 years of experience in the administration and management fields, the last 4 of which have been in the BLM Oregon State Office.

Heather Ulrich – Cultural Resources and Tribal Interests. Heather earned a Bachelor of Arts and Master of Science in Anthropology at the University of Oregon. She has been with the BLM since 2007 and currently works as the District Archaeologist and Tribal Liaison in both the Salem and Eugene Districts.

Jena Volpe – Fire and Fuels. Jena earned a Master of Science in Biology/Fire Ecology from Southern Oregon University. She has 13 years of experience in fire ecology and fuels management with the National Park Service and the BLM in southwest Oregon and is currently a Fire Ecologist in the Medford District.

Abe Wheeler – Forest Management. Abe earned an Associate of Arts in Business Administration at Linn Benton Community College, and a Bachelor of Science in Forest Management at Oregon State University. He has 8 years of experience with the BLM in field forestry, timber sale contract preparation, sale planning, and project leadership. Abe was also a key player in the recent design, analysis, and implementation of Roseburg District’s Secretarial Pilot Project, as well as other more recent ecological forestry projects. He is currently the O&C Forester in the Oregon State Office.

Several contract efforts support the work of the interdisciplinary team:

- A team of specialists at Mason, Bruce, & Girard, Inc., under the project management of Mark Rasmussen (Mason, Bruce, & Girard, Inc.), has conducted vegetation modeling of the alternatives using the Woodstock Optimization Platform model (Woodstock). Carolina Hooper of the interdisciplinary team has directed this work.
- A team of specialists at Environmental Resources Management (ERM) and subcontractors, under the project management of Clive Graham and Benjamin Sussman, ERM, has conducted socioeconomic analysis of the alternatives. Stewart Allen of the interdisciplinary team has directed this work.
- David W. LaPlante of Natural Resource Geospatial in Yreka, California, and Jeffrey R. Dunk of Humboldt State University in Arcata, California, have assisted the BLM with its evaluation of the northern spotted owl. They used the MaxEnt computer model to forecast how northern spotted owl habitat conditions would change on BLM-administered lands in western Oregon under different management scenarios. They used the spatially explicit, individual-based population model HexSim to forecast how northern spotted owls would respond demographically to such changes. Eric Greenquist and Craig Ducey of the interdisciplinary team have directed this work.
- A team of specialists at ECONorthwest assisted the BLM with its evaluation of recreation supply and demand throughout the project area. ECONorthwest collected recreation supply and demand data to identify particularly valuable recreation activities or resources for development, and estimate the value of recreation use and improvements. Zach Jarrett of the interdisciplinary team has directed this work.

References

- USDC NMFS. 2015. Letter from Kim W. Kratz, Assistant Regional Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, to Jerome E. Perez, State Director, BLM. December 18, 2015. On file with the BLM Oregon State Office, Portland, Oregon.
- USDI BLM. 2012. Programmatic Agreement Among the Bureau of Land Management, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers Regarding the Manner in Which the BLM Will Meet Its Responsibilities Under the National Historic Preservation Act. 20 pp. http://www.blm.gov/style/medialib/blm/wo/Planning_and_Renewable_Resources/coop_agencies/cr_publications.Par.51382.File.dat/PA_Signed_Package.pdf.
- . 2015. State Protocol Between the Oregon-Washington State Director of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Oregon State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Regarding the Manner In Which The Bureau of Land Management Will Meet Its' Responsibilities Under the National Historic Preservation Act and the National Programmatic Agreement Among the BLM, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and The National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. Oregon BLM-Oregon SHPO. Portland, OR. <http://www.achp.gov/blm/OR%20PROTOCOL%20SIGNED.pdf>.
- . 2016. Early Review with the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Draft Progress Tracking. Unpublished document on file with the BLM Oregon State Office, Portland, Oregon.
- . 2016. Proposed RMP/Final EIS mailing list. Unpublished document on file with the BLM Oregon State Office, Portland, Oregon.