

From: [Hoffheins, Donald K](#)
To: [BLM_OR_RMPs_WesternOregon](#)
Subject: FW: Forest Management Plan
Date: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 5:24:24 PM

This is sent to the RMPs mailbox because it came through the BLM's regular email system. I found that it had not been entered into the log sheets so it has now been added as Comment #557. Please print for Record.

Don Hoffheins
RMPs for Western Oregon
Interim Interdisciplinary Team Leader
503-808-6296 (Portland)
541-885-4105 (Klamath Falls)
541-892-8207 (Cell)

From: Brown, Mark A
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2012 11:02 AM
To: Folliard, Lee B
Cc: Hoffheins, Donald K
Subject: RE: Forest Management Plan

Thanks Lee

Mark A. Brown
Project Manager
Resource Management Plans for Western Oregon
Bureau of Land Management
(503) 808-6233, Cell (971) 275-2710

From: Folliard, Lee B
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2012 11:01 AM
To: Brown, Mark A
Subject: FW: Forest Management Plan

Not sure what the context is for this, but it may be our scoping meeting in Salem.

Lee Folliard
Branch Chief, Forest Resources & Special Status Species
OR/WA State Office BLM
503-808-6077
lfolliard@blm.gov

From: BLM_OR_SO_930_Mail
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2012 12:03 PM
To: BLM_OR_SO_931
Subject: FW: Forest Management Plan

From: BLM_OR_SO_Land_Office_Mail
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2012 8:25 AM
To: BLM_OR_SO_930_Mail
Subject: FW: Forest Management Plan

FYI!

Maggie D. Weaver
Senior Contact Representative
OSO Land Office (OR936.2)
Phone-503-808-6008
Fax-503-808-6422

From: Don Esch [<mailto:donesch@msn.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2012 10:01 PM
To: BLM_OR_SO_Land_Office_Mail
Cc: Tom Quintal; John Esch
Subject: Forest Management Plan

Folks,

I have tried to submit a reply to your url and wasn't successful in doing so. Sending it this route will maybe get it through.

I attended the meeting here in Salem, OR on 5/30/12 and am in complete agreement with the conversation between her and your presenters. I had the feeling that your plans were already decided and our input would have been falling on deaf ears.

Better management of areas that are already considered critical habitat, and the prevention or closing off more of our productive timber and resources would seem more appropriate. This would including the stopping of closing any additional roads restricting our access.

I was especially unimpressed talking to the fish biologist concerning suction dredging. When I continued to asked him about the effects of suction dredging, and his insistence that it was harming fish mortality, the only study that supported his position, was done a in laboratory test tank which did show harm to the fish. He did not have any supporting information from past studies that were previously done by the Army Corps of Engineers, US Forest Service, or the from the Department of Fish and Wildlife showing that suction dredging had a minimum affect and actually showed a benefit to the streams. These studies were done in stream and not in a test tank where conditions could be manipulated to show results they wanted.

Respectfully

Don Esch

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representatives talk with members of the public during a meeting Monday at the Redding Civic Auditorium to discuss a proposal to expand the protected area for the spotted owl in California, Oregon and Washington.

Redwood National and State Parks The northern spotted owl is listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

Diane Richards was ready to chew out some public officials Monday.

There were plenty on hand at the Redding Convention Center, where the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service held a public information session about a proposal to expand critical habitat for the northern spotted owl.

The Hayfork resident thinks federal officials are going in the wrong direction in their effort to assist in the survival of the spotted owl, which is listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. And she told them so.

"Their policy now is to let it burn, and that is killing off many nesting pairs," Richards said, referring to just one forest management policy she says is not good for the survival of the owls.

Changes in the spotted owl's habitat plus the barred owl are hurting the spotted owl, federal officials said.

Officials believe there are roughly 3,000 to 5,000 spotted owls, and their numbers are declining by about 3 percent a year, Paul Henson, the fish and wildlife service's Oregon state supervisor said this year.

The spotted owl has created controversy since it was listed as a threatened species in 1990. The wildlife service declared in 1992 that 6.7 million acres were needed as critical habitat for the owl's survival in California, Washington and Oregon.

In 2008 the agency proposed reducing the area to 5.3 million acres in the three states.

After lawsuits were filed challenging the revised critical habitat, a federal judge ordered the Fish and Wildlife Service to rewrite it. The agency is holding public information sessions in the three states affected and are required to publish a new habitat designation by Nov. 15.

Erin Williams, the wildlife service's field office supervisor in Yreka, said two meetings in Redding on Monday were an opportunity for the public to learn more about the plan and to offer comments that would help agency scientists determine which areas should be included.

"They help inform what that designation will look like," Williams said of written comments from the public.

Williams estimated about 75 people attended the first session. Agency officials said many of those who attended were frustrated with the format, which did not include an opportunity to speak publicly about the proposal.

Richards said she was undaunted and moved from information station to information station questioning officials.

The current habitat proposal includes about 9.7 million acres in California, Washington and Oregon. That includes some acreage in Shasta, Tehama, Trinity and Siskiyou counties.

Most of that area is on U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management land. Only 14 percent of

the critical habitat includes private land, Henson said.

Jen Baxter of Primary Industrial Economics Inc., who did an economic analysis of various alternative habitat designation proposals, said private forest land owners in California aren't likely to be affected by increasing the critical habitat for the spotted owl because private landowners don't get permits from the federal government to harvest timber.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection officials already require timber harvest plans that help preserve spotted owls on private land, Baxter said.

Baxter said the fish and wildlife agency is considering three alternatives that would range from reducing timber harvests on federal land by as much as 24.5 million board-feet annually, to increasing timber cutting as much as 12.3 million board feet a year.

Each million board-feet of lumber harvested equals about nine jobs for local economies, Baxter said.

Under the highest timber harvest alternative, the federal government would take in an additional \$3 million a year, while the alternative with the biggest cutbacks would result in a loss of about \$6.1 million annually, she said.

In addition to increasing the size of the critical habitat area, the wildlife agency wants to remove barred owls from some areas where spotted owls live, said Betsy Glenn, a spotted owl specialist from Portland, Ore.

Barred owls are "out-competing" spotted owls, she said.

The barred owls, which are not native to the West Coast, are larger than spotted owls, can live in more areas and eat a wider variety of foods, she said.

The agency hasn't decided how many barred owls need to be removed, but proposals range from as few as 255 in a four- to seven-year period, to 8,953 in three to five years.

Richards said the federal government needs to do a better job managing its forest, rather than expand the area needed to protect spotted owls.

The Forest Service could do a better job of removing downed trees and undergrowth, which when left in the forest increases the intensity of size of forest fires.

The Forest Service also is closing roads, making it harder to fight fires and remove brush and dead trees.

"We're very against this. I bet there's nobody in Trinity County that's for this, because of the mismanagement," Richards said.