

To: Hooper, Carolina[chooper@blm.gov]
From: Mastrofini, Kristi
Sent: 2017-05-26T16:56:46-04:00
Importance: Normal
Subject: Re: Updated Forms for Monument Review.
Received: 2017-05-26T16:56:53-04:00

Let me take a look. Are you here next week.

On Fri, May 26, 2017 at 1:40 PM, Hooper, Carolina <chooper@blm.gov> wrote:

Hi Kristi,
What I have enclosed is a report I did on the impacts of the CSME on planned timber volumes. This information was also shared with our lawyers.

I'd be happy to break this down to a few numbers that can be put into your data request. Would that be helpful? The report includes planned timber volume from harvest landbase, as well as timber volume from the late-successional reserve during the first 50 years. These should be combined to give you a total number.

This is just for the CS expansion area in Oregon. The Original monument, has no planned harvest. I do not have any information on what could have been planned in California.

Just let me know what else I should do to assist with this. I will be in on Tuesday, and I will do it then.

Carolina

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Mastrofini, Kristi** <kmastrof@blm.gov>
Date: Thu, May 25, 2017 at 4:53 PM
Subject: Re: Updated Forms for Monument Review.
To: "Hooper, Carolina" <chooper@blm.gov>
Cc: "Magee, Gerald (Jerry)" <gmagee@blm.gov>, "Campbell, Madeline" <m1campbe@blm.gov>, Abraham Wheeler <a2wheele@blm.gov>, Sandra Stevens <sstevens@blm.gov>, Joel Brumm <jbrumm@blm.gov>

I can see the message trails but your referenced attachment did not come through. Can you please forward me the information.

Thank you,
Kristi Mastrofini

On Thu, May 25, 2017 at 1:18 PM, Hooper, Carolina <chooper@blm.gov> wrote:

Jerry,

In general for forestry related data-calls, Abe provides data on what we have done in the timber sale program, and the fairly immediate actual timber sale plan (what is currently planned by the Districts). He is the data steward for TSIS.

I provide data on what we planned to do (i.e. in the RMP's for WO). This is generally bigger picture (what-if scenarios). I provide any long range projections.. what was the projected volume in the next 50 years...? I usually use the RMP modeling data and also Microstorms (I'm the M*S data steward)

So, for this request, per my reading, Abe should answer questions 2d and 3d, and I answer question 4d.

I completely concur that data consistency is paramount. To my knowledge, the report that I attached is what has been used to quantify the longer-term impacts to the BLM's timber program from the CSME. It has certainly been shared with our lawyers, I wasn't actually involved in those conversations, so I'm not completely clear on its use.

I hope that is helpful.

Carolina

On Thu, May 25, 2017 at 11:18 AM, Magee, Gerald (Jerry) <gimagee@blm.gov> wrote:

Hi Carolina,

I just wanted to share the results of a conversation I had with Mike Kinsey regarding Kristi Mastrofini's concern about consistency of the data we use for the data call compared to data that may be used in the current Monument Expansion litigation. Mike recommended that we go through either Dave Roche or Abe Wheeler to make sure we'll be using the same data that is used in the lawsuits. Kristi was going to reach out to Abe.

But if you're the person we should be communicating with instead, please set us straight so that we're all getting compatible data.

And WO approved of our plan to distinguish data among the Original Monument and the Expansion Area for this data call, so we hope to be able to add up the figures within those two categories.

Thanks for whatever help/advice you can provide.

Jerry Magee
BLM Oregon-Washington State Office
Wilderness & Nat'l Conservation Lands Program Lead
Telephone: (503) 808-6086
FAX: (503) 808-6021
Email: gimagee@blm.gov



On Thu, May 25, 2017 at 9:06 AM, Hooper, Carolina <chooper@blm.gov> wrote:

Madeline,

I have already calculated the project harvest from the CS monument expansion for other data requests. I used the expansion boundary and the modeling projections for that area. I would prefer if you used this information as it has already been disseminated.

I've included a report that gives the information that you are looking for.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Carolina

On Thu, May 25, 2017 at 8:49 AM, Campbell, Madeline <m1campbe@blm.gov> wrote:

Hi,

We got this data call for the Cascade Siskyou national Monument. I can get at all of our outyear timber sale plans for the monument area, but I was wondering if you the modelling could give us an idea of annual growth/productivity for just that area (look at question 4)? I was thinking that if Carolina remodelled our area without that ground maybe we could use the original model minus that model to come up with annual growth for that area? Let me know if this is possible, if not, I will see what else I can come up with. Oh, and I need it by COB on Tues. Thanks.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Donald Holmstrom** <dholmstr@blm.gov>

Date: Wed, May 24, 2017 at 6:40 AM

Subject: Fwd: Updated Forms for Monument Review.

To: KFMT <blm_or_kf_management_team@blm.gov>, Madeline Campbell
<m1campbe@blm.gov>

I would like to get together early this afternoon if with you to come up with a strategy if possible.

Let's talk about the TO stuff Loretta wants at the same meeting.

If 1:00 works for everyone, let's meet in the conference room.

Thanks
Don

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Magee, Gerald (Jerry)" <gmagee@blm.gov>
Date: May 23, 2017 at 5:02:44 PM PDT
To: Kristi Mastrofina <kmastrof@blm.gov>, Joel Brumm <jbrumm@blm.gov>, Donald Holmstrom <dholmstr@blm.gov>, William Kuntz <wkuntz@blm.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Updated Forms for Monument Review.

Hi all,

Attached are the corrected forms for the NM Data Call. Mostly corrections to numbering and lettering order, but I want to make sure we use the latest.

As you may have heard, WO clarified that State responses are due on May 31 to give them 2 days for WO oversight and submittal to DOI by June 2nd. So we'll need to have combined answers to each question by May 31 (requiring sharing of all needed info before that date). There was a strong hint for states w/ only one Monument to submit their info before May 31, so we'll do our best. Here are some highlights of Monday's nat'l conf call:

- I asked WO about our plan to distinguish the original Monument from the Expansion Area for all or most questions where the answers are very different (e.g., timber harvest, livestock grazing, energy infrastructure), and they agreed it would be a good idea. It becomes necessary anyway for the "5 yrs prior" questions, as each piece has a different timeframe.
- WO reiterated that we are not expected to create new data. We only provide what is already available and say when we don't have the necessary info to answer a certain question.
- The Bears Ears example distributed previously provides a model for dealing with the LUP questions when the Monument lands have not yet been subjected to a Monument specific RMP, so we'll follow that lead for the Expansion Area (OR and CA). We'll upload each pertinent RMP into the Drive site (uploading to the site I sent out and then I have permission to add it to the nat'l site). They like having both the doc in the Drive plus a link to the doc online.
- In the "Additional Questions" handout, we can use the boilerplate language if we don't have anything specific to add. So for item (b), which is specific to cultural resources, we only add specifics about any particular cult res law if something very specific about them has been applied to this Monument. And we only mention ACECs under this question if they are for cult res purposes. I don't believe any of ours relate specifically to cult resources.
- In item (c), we only have the Soda Mtn Wilderness (no WSAs. I don't believe there are any LWCs on the OR side).
- For those docs that we upload to the nat'l site, DOI appreciates starting the filenames w/ the Question number (e.g., Q 1b Record of Decision for...)
- WO is excerpting economic report text pertinent to each of our NMs and uploading to our Drive folders, so we don't have to do that (although I don't see where it's being asked for. The report is tied to visitation).
- WO advised that if you need NOC assistance with RAS data for our unit, contact Lynnda Jackson

(l50jacks@blm.gov) right away. (I just rec'd a link to data from Lynnda via Tim Fisher which I'm forwarding to you under separate cover. She must be trying to shortcut the inquiries.)

I believe this is what we have to work with for now. I'll fwd Lynnda's link in the next email.

Please let me know if you have other questions.

Thanks, and good luck.

Jerry Magee
BLM Oregon-Washington State Office
Wilderness & Nat'l Conservation Lands Program Lead
Telephone: (503) 808-6086
FAX: (503) 808-6021
Email: gmagee@blm.gov

--

Madeline Campbell
KFRA BLM
541-885-4130
m1campbe@blm.gov

--

Carolina Hooper
Forester Analyst
Oregon State Office -OR931

located at:
Northwest Oregon BLM office
1717 Fabry St. Salem, OR 97306
phone: 503-315-5927
fax: 503-375-5622

"It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data. Insensibly one begins to twist facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts" - Sherlock Holmes

--

Carolina Hooper
Forester Analyst
Oregon State Office -OR931

located at:

Northwest Oregon BLM office
1717 Fabry St. Salem, OR 97306
phone: 503-315-5927
fax: 503-375-5622

"It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data. Insensibly one begins to twist facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts" - Sherlock Holmes

--

Kristi Mastrofini
Ashland Field Manager
Medford District Office

541-618-2438

3040 Biddle Road
Medford, OR 97504

--

Carolina Hooper
Forester Analyst
Oregon State Office -OR931

located at:

Northwest Oregon BLM office
1717 Fabry St. Salem, OR 97306
phone: 503-315-5927
fax: 503-375-5622

"It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data. Insensibly one begins to twist facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts" - Sherlock Holmes

--

Kristi Mastrofini
Ashland Field Manager
Medford District Office

541-618-2438

3040 Biddle Road
Medford, OR 97504

