



**BLM’S RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR WESTERN OREGON
Cooperating Agencies Advisory Group Meeting**

January 7 & 8, 2015

ACTION	WHO	BY WHEN
Create a ‘CAAG Involvement’ timeline and plan	Project Team	Next CAAG mtg
Convene CAAG Outreach workgroup to discuss outreach ideas	Project Team & DSC	End of January
Provide CAAG data sets and format for providing input to BLM.	Project Team	Next CAAG mtg

CAAG members present for all of part of the January 7th & 8th meeting: Patty Burke (BLM DM – Coos Bay), Chris Cadwell (AOCC), Chad Davis (ODF), Kevin Davis (AOCC), Ray Davis (USFS), Betsy Glenn (USFWS), Abbie Jossie (BLM-Roseburg), Allen Henning (EPA), Don Holmstrom (for BLM DM–Klamath Falls), Annabelle Jaramillo (Benton County), Mike Kennedy (Siletz Tribe), Tony Kerwin (for BLM DM-Medford), Rod Krahrmer (ODFW), Teresa Kubo (US EPA), Van Manning (AOCC), Jim Muck (NOAA), Ric Rine (USFS), Doug Robertson (AOCC) Kathryn Stangl (BLM DM- Eugene), Jim Thraillkill (USFWS), Kim Titus (BLM-Salem), Tim Vredenburg (Cow Creek Tribes), Peter Wakeland (Coquille Tribe), Brendan White (USFWS), Mike Wilson (Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde)

CAAG members on the phone: Jody Caicco (USFWS), Margaret Corvi (Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua & Siuslaw), Josh Seeds (DEQ),

BLM staff present for all or part of the January 7th & 8th meeting: Mark Brown (BLM -State Office), Steven Fowler (BLM – Coos Bay), Richard Hardt (BLM-State Office), Megan Harper (BLM-Coos Bay), Mike Haske (BLM-State Office), Trish Hogervorst (BLM-Salem), Carolina Hooper (BLM – Salem), Sarah Levy (BLM- State Office), Scott Lightcap (BLM-Roseburg), Jerry Perez, (State Director), Carolyn Sands (BLM-Salem), Panchita Paulete (BLM –Eugene), Cheyne Rossbach (BLM – Roseburg), Jessica Rubado (BLM-State Office), Heather Ulrich (BLM -Eugene), Jennifer Velez (BLM – Eugene), Jody Weil (BLM – State Office)

Additional CAAG members & participants present for the January 8th meeting: Sam Brentano (Marion County – AOCC), Tony Hyde (AOCC), Tim Josi (Tillamook County – AOCC), Bob Main (Coos County Commission – AOCC), Rocky McVay (AOCC), Stephanie Miller (USFS/BLM-AREMD), Susan Morgan (Douglas County Commissioner - AOCC), Craig Pope (AOCC), Laurel Singer (OR Consensus/OR Solutions), David Brack Smith (Curry County Commissioner – AOCC), Faye Stewart (Lane County- AOCC), John Sweet (Coos County – AOCC)

Facilitation Team: Facilitator: Donna Silverberg; Facilitation Support: Robin Gumpert & Emily Plummer, DS Consulting

Meeting Summary

The following summary is provided to help the group remember the issues discussed and any actions or next steps to be taken. Notes are drafted by the DS Consulting Facilitation Team.

DAY 1
January 7, 2015

Welcome and Opening

The Facilitator, Donna Silverberg, welcomed CAAG to the meeting, stating that the purpose was to provide the Cooperating Agencies Advisory Group (CAAG) with preliminary results of BLM's alternatives effects analysis, answer questions regarding those results and begin to dialogue about next steps in the RMP planning process.

Donna asked the group if there were any changes or additions to the draft Facilitator's Summary from the December 9th CAAG meeting; no edits were noted and the draft summary was approved. The summary will be posted to the DS Consulting website (www.dsconsult.co/page28.cfm).

BLM State Director, Jerry Perez, thanked everyone for taking time to meet and discuss the analysis results. He noted that for the last two years BLM has been working hard on the RMP, with help from the cooperating agencies. Jerry pointed out that they have come a long way and now the pace and work will intensify. Jerry compared the RMP process with a University of Oregon Ducks game: BLM is now in the last two minutes of the first half during which time the full analysis will be released; work will continue with the cooperating agencies, and public comments will be heard. The remainder of the game will serve to clarify where BLM is and where they are going – with a definitive outcome coming at the very end. Jerry noted that BLM planning regulations requires the BLM to identify a 'preferred alternative' in the Draft RMP/EIS, and emphasized that it is unlikely that this preferred alternative will be the Proposed RMP without any changes, so he hoped that folks would not get stuck on responding to that preferred alternative – rather to focus on what the final outcome should be. He and his team will need help communicating this point with the broader public as well.

Mark Brown, RMP Project Lead, introduced two new members to the RMP Project Team: Sarah Levy, Public Affairs Officer, was brought on in August and Jessica Rubado, IDT Assistant Lead, will be stepping in for Lauren Pidot, who is now ID team leader for the San Juan Islands RMP.

Mark reminded CAAG that the design of the analysis was guided by the Purpose and Need statement (P&N) and that today BLM would be providing technical results of the analysis. Any philosophical or policy questions would be best directed to Jerry Perez or Mike Haske at a later time.

Results and Key Points from the Analysis

Mark also explained that the Project Team will be presenting much of the Effects Analysis results today, and this information is literally being shared with the CAAG as soon as it was completed. Thus, it has not yet been reviewed internally and it is important that this information remain confidential and not be shared outside the CAAG. Additionally, the analysis is expansive and not all of it will be covered in this broad presentation; there will be details of the analysis that are not mentioned, however, it does not mean that BLM does not consider those aspects important.

Design of Alternatives

Richard Hardt, IDT Lead, started by grounding the group in alternatives, noting that BLM analyzed the 'no action' alternative, four action alternatives, and 2 sub-alternatives which were designed to be a sensitivity analysis to show the influence of structurally complex forests and owl site protection on spotted owls and timber production. Richard walked through the land allocations for the various alternatives, noting the percentages of Late Successional Reserve (LSR), Riparian Reserve (RR), Harvest Land Base (HLB), and other allocations. It was noted that the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP) identified RR within the LSR as LSR, and if separated out, the NWFP or 'no action' alternative allocated 38% RR and 19% LSR. If considering these adjusted allocations, all of the action alternatives would reduce the extent of the RR and increase the extent of the LSR as compared to the NWFP.

Richard noted that the Harvest Land Base (HLB) is divided into sub-allocations for the alternatives:

- **Alternative A** HLB Sub-Allocations include uneven-aged management and high intensity management areas.
- **Alternative B** HLB Sub-Allocations include uneven-aged management, low intensity (relies on natural regeneration after harvest) in moist forests in designated spotted owl critical habitat, and moderate intensity (can include natural regeneration or planting, aimed at increasing complexity and early seral habitat in long term) in moist forests outside of designated spotted owl critical habitat.
- **Alternative C** HLB Sub-Allocations include uneven-aged management and high intensity management areas.
- **Alternative D** HLB Sub-Allocations include uneven-aged management, moderate intensity management in moist forests outside of designated critical habitat, and owl-habitat timber areas in known and historical spotted owl sites and designated spotted owl critical habitat, in which timber can be removed, however owl habitat must be maintained. In owl habitat timber areas, nesting, roosting and foraging habitat must all be maintained.

As noted above, Sub-Alternatives B and C were designed to see how much protection of owl sites and structurally complex forests change timber volumes and owl responses. Richard explained the sub-alternatives:

- **Sub-Alternative B** (protection of owl sites) protects all of the known and historic spotted owl sites. Unlike Alt B, Sub-Alt B does not allow for any harvest in known and historic owl sites. This sub-alt did not influence the amount of RR, however, increased the LSR and decreased the HLB as compared to Alt B.
- **Sub-Alternative C** (structurally complex forest) protects all stands currently 80 years or older. This sub-alt did not influence the amount of RR, however, increased the LSR and decreased the HLB.

Richard explained that the IDT conducted a ‘no timber harvest’ reference analysis to assess what happens if BLM does not harvest any timber and other landowners continue to manage the way they have in the past; this analysis helps test thresholds and provides additional information for plan design. However, Richard made it clear that the ‘no timber harvest’ is not a viable option as it does not meet the requirements of the P&N or other legal requirements.

For the analysis, all non-BLM landowner management is modeled the same across the alternatives and assumes landowners will continue to manage their land in the same ways as they have in the past.

Richard also noted that in order to create predictability in the plan, as stipulated in the P&N, all land allocations will be mapped through the RMP process and any changes in the location, size or type of allocation would require an amendment to the Plan.

At the request of a CAAG member, Richard provided the logical rationale behind each of the alternatives, with the strong caveat that due to the way that BLM designed the alternatives this is not an easy task and each IDT member would likely describe the rationale differently. Within this planning process, the IDT specifically avoided creating the typical spectrum of alternatives (maximum conservation, middle ground and maximum harvest) as it limits the decision maker’s range of options. However, when forced to categorize the rationale Richard explained:

- **Alternative A** is the “black and white” alternative; it puts the most land in reserves and has the least management in the reserves, and has the most intensive management in the HLB, which is small.
- **Alternative B** deals more in shades of grey and takes an active management approach. In many ways it is reflective of Professors Norm and Jerry’s concepts of ‘ecological forestry’.
- **Alternative C** is the hardest to capture in a snapshot, and is the closest to how BLM traditionally manages these lands. It is designed using the long-standing rule set for blocks of habitat for owl conservation.

- **Alternative D** is the most novel approach and calls for management of the largest portions of land, however, manages lightly. This alternative is testing the owl conservation response.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the alternatives:

- Q: Is there a basal area retention requirement for high intensity management in the HLB?
 - Response: there are no requirements for retention in the high intensity management areas.
- Q: Does Alt D include all critical habitat, as well as known and observed owl sites?
 - Response: Yes. All critical habitat, as well as known and observed owl sites, are either in the reserves or in the owl habitat timber area.

Grazing and Wild Horses

Richard reviewed the results from the grazing and wild horses analysis. He noted that currently there is grazing authorized in Coos Bay District, Klamath Falls Field Office, and Medford District. The analysis assessed almost all of the grazing allotments and 12 of the allotments were not meeting range health standards. As a result, BLM has one year to bring those allotments up to standards or grazing would be eliminated on those lands.

- **No Action Alternative** would keep current grazing management the same.
- **Alternatives A, B, and C** would make all (11) vacant allotments unavailable for grazing.
- **Alternative D** would eliminate grazing altogether.

There is one wild horse herd in the planning area and is currently within the appropriate management level at 30-50 horses. Alternative D is the only alternative that would impact wild horse herd size, as it would eliminate grazing and thus increase available forage. However, Richard noted that forage on BLM lands are not very important for this herd and there will not be a big impact on the herd under any alternative.

Minerals

Richard explained that there are three types of minerals on BLM lands: saleable, locatable, and leasable minerals. Saleable minerals are predominantly aggregate, sand and gravel, which are used for constructing roads. The RMP will help determine what areas are closed for mining saleable minerals, a designation that is largely connected to other management allocations. The acreage closed depends on the acreage allocated for management purposes. Richard noted that all of the action alternatives would increase the acreage closed to saleable minerals.

Locatable minerals in the planning area most consist of gold in Medford. BLM does not have the authority to close these lands; however, the RMP will identify areas where BLM can petition to the Secretary of Interior to withdraw these lands from locatable minerals. The analysis evaluated for the acreage of lands that BLM *may* petition for withdrawal and is tied to other land-use allocations or management decisions, such as wild and scenic rivers, lands with wilderness characteristics, etc.

Leasable minerals include oil, gas, and coal. There is no current or forecasted development of leasable minerals in the decision area.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the minerals:

- Q: If lands are withdrawn from locatable mineral allocations would it limit recreational mining?
 - Response: Yes, if the allocation is withdrawn it would exclude all mining of locatable minerals, including recreational.

Sustainable Energy

Richard explained that there are four sustainable energy resources that were analyzed: geothermal, wind, solar, and biomass. He shared that there is currently no plan for development of sustainable energy in the decision area, except biomass. In regards to the alternatives, the approaches to sustainable energy were largely dictated by other management decisions, for example wind energy is administered through a 'right of way' grant, which designates 'exclusion' or 'avoidance' areas in which wind energy may or may not be

permitted. Similarly, geothermal is administered through leases and is tied to other land-use decisions; Richard noted that there is little prospect of developing geothermal resources in the decision area.

Biomass energy is primarily sold as a byproduct of timber harvest and the supply is dictated by the amount of timber harvest which varies by alternative. The presence and proximity of processing plants also feeds into the feasibility of future biomass development.

Lands and Realty

The RMP would dictate the acres in right of way avoidance and exclusion areas. Alternatives A, B, and C would increase the amount of acreage in right of way avoidance or exclusion areas, whereas Alternative D slightly lower the acreage in right of way avoidance areas. Richard explained that if BLM was to get a request for a right of way within a right of way exclusion area (after the ROD is signed), they would then have to amend the RMP in order to grant the right of way. The RMP will not impact existing rights of way.

Forest Management

Richard reminded the group that the terms ‘allowable sale quantity’ (ASQ), ‘annual sustained yield capacity’ and ‘annual productive capacity’ are synonyms and are used interchangeably. The sustained yield units (SYU) are aligned with the BLM District boundaries and thus ASQ volumes are determined at the District level, not the region. The RMP does not propose to change the SYU boundaries, so if there is a moist and dry RMP, it will not impact the SYUs. Richard defined the ASQ as the timber volume that the forest can produce continuously, under the intensity of management described in the RMP, on those lands allocated for sustainable yield timber production. He noted that both the harvest intensity, restrictions on timber production in the HLB (for example survey requirements for murrelets) and the size of the HLB are key factors contributing to the ASQ. He also noted that if the No Action alternative could be implemented as written (which it cannot), it would yield a higher ASQ than all but one of the main alternatives.

The current ASQ is not what is calculated for the ‘no action’ alternative due to the fact that over the last 20 years the volume within the Matrix lands has increased. In addition, now BLM has better information regarding the extent of the RR and there is less acreage protected within the RR than previously thought. Therefore, there is actually more acreage in the Matrix than was estimated when the BLM calculated the current ASQ.

Richard also provided details on the non-ASQ volume results. He noted that, because the non-ASQ is calculated from trees that are cut outside of the HLB for objectives such as creating habitat and fire management, the volume will go down over time. This is not true for the ASQ which is designed to provide a sustained yield of timber throughout the life of the RMP. The non-ASQ counts towards receipts to counties. Richard noted that in Alt A the thinning is directed to be non-commercial in the moist forest in the riparian reserves and LSR, and in Alt D there are no opportunities for thinning in the LSR and limited opportunities in the RR.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding forest management:

- Q: Is there a determined level of commitment for the non-ASQ volume?
 - Response: The non-ASQ volume is a projection of a byproduct, thus it is not as predictable and reliable as the ASQ. It was calculated for the purpose of analysis, however, is not a stated commitment like the ASQ is.
- Q: The RMP dictates an ASQ, but what happens if the ASQ is not met?
 - Response: The ASQ is a declaration of what BLM sees as its commitment to produce throughout the duration of the plan – and as such is synonymous with ‘sustained yield capacity’; it is up to the courts to determine what happens if this commitment is not met.
- Q: Why do you anticipate the non-ASQ volumes to decrease over time?

- Response: BLM will work our way through the stands that need management, however, these stands will be treated and our management will not continuously produce young stands, thus the need for management and consequently non-ASQ volume will decrease. There will however, continue to be non-ASQ generated from fire management.
- Q: Did you calculate non-ASQ beyond the first decade?
 - Response: We did, and it differs among the alternatives because the reasons for thinning differ. The non-ASQ fluctuates over time, however, does not have an abrupt termination.
- Comment: Need to display/explain the no alternative ASQ calculation differently – it was confusing as presented today.

Northern Spotted Owls

The owl analysis utilized three different models: Woodstock, Maxent and Hexsim; this analysis includes forest development, relative habitat suitability, and owl population. Richard noted that at first, the IDT thought that the design of large block reserves, protection of older, more structurally complex forests, management of owl sites, and management of the HLB would be the major variables contributing to owl response.

Richard reviewed the large block network as well as owl dispersal and population response results, noting that in order to provide a baseline the IDT ran the models using a No Timber Harvest reference analysis, illustrating what would happen to development of large blocks of owl habitat, owl dispersal and owl populations if BLM did not cut any of the trees on their lands (note: this scenario is NOT an alternative, as it does not meet the P&N).

The development of a network of large blocks of owl habitat does not differ much across the alternatives and most alternatives, except for the ‘no action’ and Alt C, have similar responses as the No Timber Harvest reference analysis. As far as owl dispersal, the analysis shows that BLM can influence movement, creating opportunities for dispersal between the Coast Range and Cascade populations. In regards to owl population response, all alternatives and the ‘no harvest’ scenario show a downward trend in most provinces. Richard pointed out that in the Oregon coast province, all alternatives and the No Timber Harvest reference analysis show a downward trend towards extirpation within 30 years, despite different management practices. This is due to the influence of the barred owl. In order to test the barred owl influence, the IDT ran an analysis of the No Timber Harvest reference analysis with reduced barred owl encounter rates, which resulted in a substantially slower decline, but a decline nonetheless.

Because NEPA requires an EIS to analyze based on actions and effects that are “reasonably foreseeable”, the BLM assumed in the analysis of the alternatives continuation of the current barred owl encounter rates. USFWS is still in the process of implementing an experimental barred owl control study and has made no proposal or decision about conducting barred owl control beyond this experimental study.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the spotted owl analysis:

- Q: Is the large block reserve size limitation for alternative C 25 pairs of NSO?
 - Response: Yes.
- Q: Is there a threshold for determining when dispersal is occurring?
 - Response: There is not a threshold, it is a gradient based on the modeled number of trips per year. The main point is that the dispersal outcomes differ little among the alternatives, with small exceptions.
- Q: Is there a difference in the way that north coastal and south interior were analyzed for dispersal?
 - Response: No, the pair requirements are the same. However, the home range size differs across the areas. Also, inputs to Woodstock and the fire analysis are different.
- Comment: The Woodstock model looks at vegetation management, however, it does not assume that harvest always results in lower owl survival.
 - Response: That is correct; in some stands harvest could benefit owls.

- Q: Is the probability of fire factored in?
 - Response: Yes, the probability of fire is factored in to all alternatives.
- Q: Does fire probability change across alternatives depending on management?
 - Response: No, the probability of fire does not change across the alternatives and we are not expecting BLM management to severely alter the probability of fire in this 50-year timeframe.
- Q: What would a barred owl control program that has a meaningful impact on NSO populations look like?
 - Response: That has not yet been determined; however, for the analysis the simulated control was not range wide, it was focused on where control emphasis would likely be. The USFWS provided an estimation of what would happen in the future in each region if the USFWS were to implement a control program, combined with their prediction of how barred owl encounter rates would change over time. In some areas the barred owl populations would go up, and decrease in other areas. The simulation did not assume that barred owls would ever be removed completely.
- Q: Did all of the alternatives produce the same response with the barred owl control analysis?
 - Response: The IDT did not have time to run the analysis for all of the alternatives. Also, at this point the control program is not considered a “reasonably foreseeable” future action under NEPA. The IDT may run the barred owl control analysis on the alternatives to provide more information for development of the Proposed RMP or if the control program becomes reasonably foreseeable.
- Q: Why do you assume that the barred owl encounter rates will go up?
 - Response: The analysis of the alternatives assumed continuation of current encounter rates. The assumption of increased encounter rates in some regions was only used as part of the modified barred owl encounter rates. The USFWS made these predictions based off of what we’ve seen in the past. The increased number of barred owls in the area, and the longer they stay in the area, the higher the encounter rates are.
- Q: Can NSO habitat creation be contributing to the increase in barred owls?
 - Response: There is no evidence of this. Barred owls do well in NSO habitat; however, they are generalists and can survive in a range of habitats, even urban areas.
- Q: Does the population response look the same across all alternatives in all regions?
 - Response: No, there are some differences depending on the region.

Marbled Murrelet

The IDT analyzed the effects of the alternatives on the low and high quality nesting habitat for marbled murrelets. All of the alternatives increase the total volume of habitat within 50 years. Both the ‘no action’ and Alternative D look similar to the No Timber Harvest reference analysis. Richard explained that all of the alternatives have some murrelet habitat within the HLB, however, require varying degrees of protection:

- The **No Action alternative** has the most murrelet habitat in the HLB and requires surveys.
- **Alternative A** does not require surveys and has the second-smallest amount of murrelet habitat in the HLB.
- **Alternative B** has the smallest amount of habitat in the HLB and requires most of it to be surveyed.
- **Alternative C** has of the second-most murrelet habitat in the HLB and does not require most of it to be surveyed.
- **Alternative D** has of the third-most murrelet habitat in the HLB and requires surveys.

Where marbled murrelets surveys are required, found sites would be protected. In the analysis, the BLM predicts future marbled murrelet sites in the HLB under each alternative. The analysis forecasted how many sites would likely be found and protected, how many would not be found and thus likely lost under each alternative. This provides a basis for describing harm to the species if the BLM decides to ask for take for murrelets.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the marbled murrelet analysis:

- Q: How are you defining a murrelet site?
 - Response: A site is determined where we see evidence of nesting behavior.
- Q: What is the criterion for high quality habitat?
 - Response: High quality habitat is based on the structural characteristics of the stand.
- Q: This is a static look at the current existing habitat, however, the habitat will increase over time, how will the increase in habitat be handled?
 - Response: Yes, these numbers are based on the current sites. However, depending on surveys, there will be additions and subtractions of nesting areas within the HLB.
- Q: What is the rationale behind the 300-foot protection around sites in Alternatives B and C?
 - Response: The No Action alternative and Alternative D call for ½-mile protection around sites. The Marbled Murrelet Recovery Plan calls for a 300-600ft buffer – in order to broaden the range of alternatives, given that the No Action alternative and Alternative D call for widths larger than 300-600 feet, the IDT decided to test for the minimum of the range in the recovery plan

Fisher

In October, 2014, the USWFS proposed that the west coast population of fisher is listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. There is fisher habitat and documented occurrences on BLM administered lands in both Medford and Klamath Falls.

The analysis looked at denning, resting and foraging habitat. Analysis results showed that all action alternatives would increase overall habitat, specifically denning habitat, whereas the ‘no action’ alternative decreases habitat.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the fisher analysis:

- Q: Did you use the owl analysis for fisher?
 - Response: The IDT conducted a structural analysis for denning and resting habitat.
- Q: How do the management practices of the various alternatives impact habitat, for example high intensity harvest and not leaving snags.
 - Response: The IDT looked at whether or not young forests have structural legacies to determine if the stands were habitat or not.

Red Tree Vole (north coast distinct population segment (DPS))

Richard explained that the USFWS concluded that the North Coast DPS red tree vole warrants listing, but listing is precluded by higher priorities. The IDT conducted a species specific analysis for red tree voles. This analysis was similar to the marbled murrelet analysis in that it analyzed for a variety of survey and protection requirements.

The analysis forecasted how many sites would likely be found and protected, how many would not be found and thus likely lost. Richard noted that this only addresses the North Coast DPS, not the entire species. The ‘no action’ alternative, and Alternatives B and D would require pre-project surveys, Alternatives A and C would not require surveying and thus will likely contribute to vole habitat loss. Regardless, all alternatives would increase habitat as compared to the current conditions.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the red tree vole analysis:

- Q: The ‘no action’ alternative requires survey and manage, and Alternatives B and D include survey and protect, what is the difference?
 - Response: Survey and Manage under the No Action alternative is designed for rare or little known species thought to be associated with late-successional and old-growth forests. Under Alternatives B and D, the surveying and protection measures would be only for North Coast DPS red tree vole and only because of its status as warranted but precluded.

- Q: Do the red tree vole and marbled murrelet sites overlap?
 - Response: Red tree vole and murrelet sites can be the same site, however, the sites are not taken out twice from the vegetation model; the sites are not double counted.

Other Wildlife

The analysis showed that for most of the sensitive, strategic, and survey and manage species all of the alternatives will increase habitat substantially or be in line with the average historical conditions over the next 50 years. This is based off of an increase in the distribution of structural stages on BLM administered lands. When looking at early successional forests and young stands with some structural legacies, the ‘no action’ alternative has largest increase in habitat, Alternative A has a limited and small HLB, thus it has the largest decrease of this habitat. Alternative C also decreases the amount of early successional forests and young stands with some structural legacies habitat. The ‘no action’, and Alternatives B and D have increases of this habitat as compared to current conditions as a result of the management practices.

Deer and Elk

The IDT analyzed for forage habitat of black tailed deer and Roosevelt elk. The results depend on timber harvest and acres of regeneration. Richard explained that all of the alternatives increase the amount of high quality forage habitat for these species.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the deer and elk analysis:

- Q: Is this analysis basically looking at the amount and size of openings that are created?
 - Response: The analysis looks at the structural stage of the stands.
- Q: Do the Alternatives limit the size of patches that BLM can create?
 - Response: There are no specific limits on the regeneration harvest patch size.

Survey and Manage Species

Richard noted that none of the action alternatives would carry forward the Survey and Manage standards and guidelines, however, for all alternatives there would be sufficient habitat to support stable populations for most of these species. For Bureau sensitive species there is still manager discretion as to if they survey and protect a species. There is a lot of flexibility in how Bureau sensitive species are managed. Generally, management guidance on Bureau sensitive species is to manage for the species as to not contribute to its listing. There will be a description of the effects (from a NEPA point of view) on Survey and Manage species in the EIS, however, there will not be species specific determinations.

Rare Plants and Fungi

There are two federally listed plants found within the forested areas within the decision area. Under all alternatives the BLM would conduct pre-disturbance survey and apply conservation measures for federally listed plants. Bureau sensitive plants and fungi would be managed under the BLM’s Sensitive Species Program; management of Bureau sensitive plants varies with all alternatives. The analysis showed that most survey and manage plants and fungi species would have sufficient habitat to support stable populations under all of the alternatives.

Roads

The analysis included both road construction and travel management. In regards to road construction, the ‘no action’ alternative resulted in the most road construction in the first decade, followed by Alternative C, B, A and the Alternative D resulting in the least amount of miles of road construction. Richard noted that currently there is a lot of maintenance work that needs to be done on BLM administered road: 30% are in fair or poor condition with depleted surface or culverts.

The travel management analysis looked at Off Highway Vehicle use. BLM categorizes OHV use into three designations: open areas, limited areas, and closed areas. The BLM decided early on to defer designation of specific roads and trails in limited areas to implementation-level transportation

management plans, however, the RMP assigns broad allocations. The vast majority of roads in all alternatives are designated as limited areas. The ‘no action’ alternative designates open areas, but none of the action alternatives designate any areas as open to OHV use .

Fish and Water

The analysis focuses on three main processes that impact fish and water: stream shading, wood delivery to streams and sediment delivery to streams. For stream shading, they used both the 2008 RMP/EIS methodology, as well as another methodology provided by EPA. Results from the BLM methodology show that all alternatives provide adequate shade with no increased stream temperatures. Results from the EPA methodology show some sections of stream would be susceptible to increased temperatures, specifically, Alts A, D and the ‘no action’ show about 30 miles (0.05% of BLM streams) increasing above the 3 units of shade threshold, and about 300 miles of stream (5% of BLM streams) exceeding the 3 units of shade threshold in Alts B and C.

For the wood delivery analysis, BLM utilized the complex analysis done in the 2008 RMP process and supplemented it with an analysis looking at the density of trees per acre (TPA) that are greater than 20 inches diameter within 1 site-potential-tree of a stream. There was only small differences amongst the alternatives, and all alternatives showed a substantial increase from the current. It was pointed out that Alts A and D show more 20 inch diameter trees per acre.

In regards to sediment delivery, Richard explained that BLM lands currently contribute 51,988 tons of sediment a year to streams and that all alternatives will add a small amount of sediment as a result of road construction. The ‘no action’ alternative would contribute the most sediment, then Alt C, B, A, and D would contribute the least sediment. He also noted that all alternatives call for decommissioning roads, and that the BLM has no basis for predicting a difference in decommissioning among the alternatives. The BLM’s ability to decommission roads is heavily influenced by others with road rights.

Richard explained that all alternatives would protect fish habitat and water quality. While it is arguable whether the slight differences among the alternatives are meaningful, all of the analyses show that Alternatives A and D are as effective or more effective than the ‘no action’ alternative, despite the fact that the riparian reserve is smaller in those alternatives.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the fish and water analysis:

- Q: Did you look at the actual ‘no action’ stream shading practices that the BLM has been implementing over the last 20 years?
 - Response: Yes, we did and the data shows that the practices are doing what they were designed to do.
- Q: How did the analysis factor in ground water and hyporheic recharge?
 - Response: It didn’t, the IDT could not find a way to analyze ground water and hyporheic recharge at this scale.
- Q: Is there any metric to use to measure structural diversity impacts on fish habitat?
 - Response: We can measure structural complexity in the stands, however, we do not have an easy way to connect this to directly to changes in fish habitat.
- Q: There are scientific disagreements with the impacts of 1 versus 2 site potential tree width buffers, how are you addressing this?
 - Response: The 1 or 2 site-potential tree height is more of a policy dispute and less of a scientific dispute, so we are not entering into that conversation in the analysis of the effects.

Fire and Fuels

Richard explained that the important variables in the fire and fuels analysis are the size of HLB and practices in the HLB within the Roseburg, Medford and Klamath Falls areas (the analysis incorporated all lands in the planning area). One thing that the IDT looked at was how management impacted the

landscapes resilience to fire over time, as compared to historical reference conditions. The IDT looked at a range of 5 seral stages, and how far management practices departed from historical reference conditions; there was no substantial change in landscape fire resiliency over time under any alternatives. More specifically, at the stand level on BLM administered lands, all alternatives improve the resiliency to fire. The 'no action' alternative improves resiliency the least, and the action alternatives create stands that are more resilient, due to un-even aged management.

As far as fire hazard, currently almost 50% of the stands in the interior/south are at high risk. All of the action alternatives decrease the risk of fire, as does the 'no action' alternative, however, not as significantly.

Salvage logging after fire is included in all alternatives in the HLB; only the No Action alternative and Alternative C would allow for salvage in the LSR.

Soil

The analysis attempted to identify detrimental soil disturbances, (for example, degraded soil quality as a result of compaction or erosion) at a broad level. Timber harvest, road construction, OHV use and fuels treatments all are factors that impact soil. When compared to the current soil disturbance, the alternatives will increase the acreage of detrimental soil disturbance by 13 to 30 percent during the first decade. This disturbance is a necessary side effect from other management decisions; however, in many cases these disturbances will get better over time, and the analysis does not quantify the effects of mitigation or amelioration. That being said, there are some disturbances that are lasting, however, it is difficult to quantify permanent disturbance at this level.

Invasive Species

The IDT looked at the risk of long and short term risk of introducing or spreading invasive plant species. Of all the sources of spreading or introducing invasive species, the analysis shows that the overall risk is lowest with Alternative A and highest with Alternative C.

In regards to sudden oak death, the 'no action' alternative, alternative C and D continue treating all detected sites. Alternative A does not treat for sudden oak death and Alternative B does not treat in the riparian reserves. This resulted in Alternative A creating 100% infestation in 10 years in Zone 1; Alternative B results were intermediate between Alternative A and the other alternatives.

Air Quality

Richard noted that all action alternatives produce more particulate emissions than the 'no action' alternative and the current conditions due to the increase in timber harvest for fuels reduction. This is due to both activity fuels and prescribed burns. Regardless, the impact will continue to be limited due to adherence to the requirements of the Oregon Smoke Management Plan.

Climate Change

The analysis examined how the alternatives would affect the amount of carbon stored on BLM administered lands over the next 50 years and calculates the net change over time, from harvest, growth, burning, etc. Results showed that carbon storage would increase under all alternatives. The alternatives differ a little bit regarding the amount stored, however, differences are less than the error in the calculations.

Richard explained that greenhouse gas emissions would increase under all alternatives, due mainly to timber harvest, livestock grazing and prescribed fire.

Climate change provides uncertainty that reserves will function as intended and that planned timber harvest levels can be attained; the uncertainty lies in that it is unknown how the climate will change or how that change will impact the lands over time. The IDT looked at how differing climate change scenarios would impact the variables over time, for example, changes in tree species ranges. Results

showed potential changes in range, growth and yield. Richard noted that the RMP direction can have specific management direction regarding infrastructure and such to address climate change issues; however, given the uncertainty, climate change has not been quantitatively incorporated into the vegetation modeling.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the climate change analysis:

- Q: How much will BLM's activities impact climate change?
 - Response: The BLM contribution represents less than 1% of the state's emissions. BLM is a small contributor and overall will be a positive contributor as storage of these lands will increase.
- Q: Is there calculation of the impact of tree/stand mortality on climate change?
 - Response: Yes, it is embedded in the changes in forest conditions in the carbon storage analysis.

Large Group Discussion

The CAAG reflected on the day of presentations and discussed what they learned, as well as key messages that stood out. The following key messages were noted:

- Lots of upward trends
- Similar outcomes across the alternatives may provide more decision space.
- Reducing large scale fire in southern Oregon is beyond BLM's land
- Crafting messages around this volume of data will be important – especially for those public who say 'don't tell me the facts, I know the truth'
- Context will be important for public outreach – we need to help the public understand the difference that BLM can/will make. E.g. with climate change – this is a big public concern. BLM needs to convey its actual contribution, a balance between 'we are doing all we can' vs. 'we can't do anything'.
- There is no such thing as right, wrong, perfect – this process is about tradeoffs – CAAG needs to help BLM put their best foot forward.
- We need to focus on improvements that the alternatives /choices will be offering to all interests.
- Messaging to the public around the Aquatic Conservation Strategy will be vital – public is likely going to push back on the changes (1 vs 2 site potential trees, etc.)
- CAAG needs to stand with BLM as partners when the draft is released.
- The CAAG/workgroup process has been spectacular, BLM has done a great job looking at all factors and the CAAG needs to help with messaging.
- Need to message to the public that forests are dynamic.

DAY 2 Meeting January 8, 2015

Results and Key Points from the Analysis

Mark Brown, Project Manager, started the day by noting that although the analysis was done by the BLM IDT, throughout the process there has been valuable collaboration with the CAAG. Richard Hardt, IDT Lead, also noted that the analysis also incorporated past analysis results and lessons learned.

Recreation

Richard explained that the alternatives are different from the 1995 RMP in that the names for allocations are the same, however the allocations are different. As a result, BLM cannot compare the analysis results to the 1995 RMP. The current alternatives utilize three recreation allocations:

- Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) – areas where recreation is the management priority.

- Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA) – BLM manages for recreation in conjunction with other resource use.
- No Recreation Management Area (NRMA) – BLM does not make an effort to provide recreational opportunities.

Richard explained the range of alternatives:

- **Alternative A** manages existing developed sites with relatively little recreation management beyond those sites.
- **Alternative B** attempts to mirror the current management, while incorporating the new allocation definitions.
- **Alternative C** has the second-highest acreage in recreation management areas.
- **Alternative D** maximizes the recreation opportunities.

The RMP will make decisions about broad allocations for recreation, however, will not specify implementation level decisions like where trails or campsites will be. Generally, the analysis provides more information on where recreation could be increased without competing with other purposes. The analysis showed that Alternative A will reduce recreation opportunities, whereas Alternative B will provide the same amount as currently provided, Alternatives C adds the 2nd highest acreage to recreation areas and Alternative D adds the largest increase in acreage into recreation management areas.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the recreation analysis:

- Q: Does the recreation analysis include O&C land and P&D land?
 - Response: Yes, this includes the entire decision area. BLM sees that they have authority to provide for recreation on O&C lands where it does not preclude sustained timber production.
- Q: What constitutes demand for recreation? If there is one voice does that constitute demand?
 - Response: Scoping helps identify opportunities for recreation, not demand. The big driver or constraint will be where BLM has legal and secure public access and where they do not; if BLM does not, they cannot allocate that land to recreation. Mark Brown added that BLM had an outside contractor conduct a recreation demand analysis to help quantify where the demand is compared to major population centers, as well as where there are more opportunities for recreation and what kind of recreation should be provided.
- Comment: BLM needs to keep in mind that there are tribal members and others who want to experience recreation away from major population centers.

Visual Resources Management

BLM has updated the visual resources inventory, using 4 classes (Class 1 = highest quality visual resource – Class 4 = lowest quality visual resource) to describe the current status of the land. Similarly, visual resource management applies these 4 classes, which all vary by alternative. All alternatives manage Congressionally reserved lands and ACECs according to their established class. Under Alternatives A, B and C all lands are managed as VRM 4, which does not restrict management to protect visual resources. Outside of the HLB, Alternative D manages to the class it is designated.

Richard shared that the analysis found that under all alternatives there will be a general decrease in visual quality in the planning area over time. The ‘no action’ alternative would have the least visual impact, Alternative D would have the 2nd lowest impact, followed by Alternatives A, B and C, which have similar impact and have the most impact (managed as class 4). It was noted that BLM has limited discretion around visual resource management within the HLB on O&C lands.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

There are currently 9 designated wild and scenic rivers in the decision area. Additionally, there are 13 rivers that were found in the 1995 RMPs to be suitable for designation. Rivers that are found to be

suitable for wild and scenic rivers designation are protected for those values until they are reviewed for designation (designation is a Congressional act). In this RMP effort, an additional 51 rivers were evaluated and of those, 6 were determined to be suitable but have not been designated.

The alternatives vary in how they would manage the rivers, however, all alternatives would continue to protect the 9 currently designated rivers, as well as the 13 rivers found to be suitable. The 'no action' alternative is what BLM is currently managing and does not include any of the 51 rivers reviewed for suitability during this RMP process. Similarly Alternative A would not include any of the 51 rivers. In addition to what is currently protected, Alternatives B and C would protect the 6 rivers found to be eligible for protection. And Alternative D would protect all 51 eligible rivers, as well as the 9 designated and 13 from the 1995 RMP. Richard noted that there has been interim protection on the 51 rivers since 1992.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the recreation analysis:

- Q: BLM has to recommend these rivers for wild and scenic rivers designation,. Until designated, how does BLM manage to a recommended designation?
 - Response: Prior to a designation determination, the BLM would manage these rivers in the same way that we manage the 13 rivers found to be suitable in the 1995 RMP, we protect the wild and scenic values until Congress designates.
- Q: How far out from the river does protection go?
 - Response: 1/4 mile in width from each bank of the river..
- Q: If the BLM provides interim protection for all of the 51 rivers until Congress acts, is that not creating de-facto wild and scenic rivers?
 - Response: The BLM will provide interim protection as long as the RMP is in place, unless amended.
- Comment: It would be helpful to show the difference between the wild and scenic river protection buffers as compared to what the buffers would look like without this designation. The O&C counties would be interested in seeing the difference that this designation makes compared to standard riparian buffers.
- Comment: Depending on the reason for wild and scenic designation, timber harvest may or may not be limited, and this is also important to point out.

Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

The BLM inventory found lands with wilderness characteristics in Salem, Coos Bay and Medford Districts (99,199 acres total). The 'no action' alternative would not manage these lands for the wilderness characteristics. Alternative A would manage nearly all of these lands, however, would not manage for wilderness characteristics within the HLB on O&C lands. Alternatives B and C would manage lands with wilderness characteristics outside of the HLB and in a way that is compatible with recreation management objectives. Alternative D would not manage to protect lands for wilderness characteristics.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the lands with wilderness characteristics analysis:

- Q: What is the criteria used to determine if a land has wilderness characteristics?
 - Response: There are multiple criteria. If the land is not contiguous to other lands with wilderness characteristics, it needs to be at least 5,000 acres, however, most of these lands are contiguous. They need to be road-less, primitive and solitude and have no past management.
- Q: Did the IDT include O&C lands in the inventory?
 - Response: Yes, all lands in the planning area were included in the inventory, however, lands are only protected outside of the HLB on O&C lands..
- Q: Are these lands managed similarly to the wild and scenic rivers where the values are protected until designated?

- Response: No, this is not related to the Wilderness Act, these lands are designated and managed under Federal Lands Policy and Management Act.
- Q: Are these lands double counted with the visual resource management areas?
 - Response: No, these lands correlate with the visual resource management lands, however, are not double counted.
- Q: Were there acres in the HLB that had wilderness characteristics and thus were excluded?
 - Response: Yes, in Alternative A there are ~2,000 acres in the HLB.
- Comment: The tribes will likely have the position that these lands were historically managed and still require management, for example managed with fire cycles, etc.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

The BLM reviews all Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) during the planning process, and this includes re-evaluating past ACECs. BLM sees limitations on their authority to designate ACECs that would preclude sustained yield production in HLB on O&C lands.

Richard explained that the ‘no action’ alternative would manage 140 current and potential ACECs. These ACECs are managed for the relevant and important values. All action alternatives decrease the number of ACECs, however, the alternatives vary depending on land allocation and management approaches needed to protect that relevant and important value. Richard pointed out that special management may not be needed to protect if the site is within a land allocation that already protects the value. Alternative C protects the least ACECs, then Alternative B, D and Alternative A protects the most of all the action alternatives. The alternatives range from 98,000 to 105,000 acres of ACECs.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the ACEC analysis:

- Q: Are ACECs established for listed plant species?
 - Response: The BLM can provide protection for listed plants under other authorities; listed plant species will be protected regardless.
- Q: How are Research Natural Areas considered?
 - Response: All Research Natural Areas are also ACECs.

Cultural & Tribal

Richard started by noting that it is difficult to do justice to the cultural and tribal analysis at this level, as cultural resources are generally more site specific. Additionally, many of these resources are addressed through other resource analyses, for example, salmon and lamprey, water quality, deer and elk. He noted that today’s presentation is not comprehensive of the entire cultural and tribal analysis.

There is high variation in the amount of areas that could have high probability of having cultural resources; however, overall this is a small portion of the planning area. The analysis generally found that these sites can be protected. Alternatives A and D are least likely to result in adverse impacts to cultural and tribal resources because these alternatives will have ground disturbing activity on the least amount of acres overall, and furthermore, the least on high probability acres.

The IDT had a specific focus on effects of the alternatives on tribal plant collection: As a result of management practices, Alternative B and C are more conducive to management of culturally important plants in the riparian areas.

Socio-Economic

Richard noted that the socio-economic analysis is enormous and he is not planning to cover all of it in his presentation. Instead, he focused on four parts: goods and services; economic activity; payments to counties; and costs to BLM. The socio-economic analysis also addresses economic stability, capacity and resiliency, and environmental justice. He added that he will be reviewing the analysis for the first decade.

Goods and services

The goods and services analysis addresses the market goods that are provided from BLM administered lands. Timber provides the greatest market value. Other goods and services include grazing, minerals, energy and special forest products. The total costs also include appropriated dollars. In regards to timber revenues, Alternative C provides the greatest revenues over the first decade, followed by the ‘no action’ alternative, then Alternatives B, A, and D.

Richard noted that it is difficult to calculate the value of non-market goods and services, including recreation and carbon storage, as these values are measured by society. Recreation produces the same value across the alternatives at this level. However, carbon storage does not, as timber harvest greatly impacts carbon storage values and varies across alternatives. The value of carbon storage is completely non-market because the BLM cannot sell carbon credits.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the goods and services analysis:

- Q: Where does the recreation value show up?
 - Response: It is treated as a non-market value (other than some permitting fees).
- Q: What constitutes the increase in timber revenues in Alternative D in 100 years?
 - Response: Alternative D calls for uneven-aged management in the majority of the HLB, in which timber volumes would go up over time. The IDT modeled sustained-yield timber production with a non-declining constraint, but did not model with even flow constraint, as the ASQ will go up eventually in Alternative D.
- Comment: It would be helpful to have a visual to help connect the dots of the current conditions compared to the alternatives.
- Comment: It would be helpful if the BLM provided the CAAG with the raw data, so that the CAAG could help determine what and how the data should be displayed for the public.
- Comment: It is a constant struggle to try and communicate technical information to non-technical people; BLM may be able to work with the counties to help communicate this information.
- Q: Did the IDT compare the cost of recreation to BLM and counties? Including access, search and rescue costs?
 - Response: BLM only analyzed for the costs to BLM of managing BLM administered lands. Costs to the counties for access and search and rescue on BLM-administered lands are not included in the analysis.
- Q: With the shift in timber production to north, have you also looked at how this shift will impact the counties?
 - Response: Yes, the economic impacts are evaluated at the county level.

Economic activity

Richard explained that the economic activity analysis included jobs and earnings, both which are analyzed at the county level. Employment included jobs that would be created through timber harvest, grazing, recreation, minerals, agency expenditures, and federal payments to counties. Alternative C provides the greatest increase in employment, followed by the ‘no action’ alternative, then Alternatives B, A, and D.

Earnings vary across the alternatives. When compared to the current condition, earnings would decrease with Alternative D, however, increase with other alternatives. Alternative C provides the greatest increase in employment compared to current conditions, followed by the ‘no action’ alternative, then Alternatives B and A.

Payments to counties

Richard explained the results of timber receipts to counties: Timber receipts would be generated from timber harvested, not offered or sold. Counties receive payments based on a formula that reflects how much O&C lands they have in their county; receipts are not contingent on where the timber is actually harvested in the O&C. In the past, NWFP payments were replaced by Secure Rural Schools funds, however, those funds have been steadily decreasing over the years. The value of the receipts is

influenced by many variables including the timber volume, log grade, size of log, and cost of logging; as a result, the more expensive the logging and the lower the value of the logs, the less receipts the counties would receive. The value of the receipts ranges across the alternatives, all alternatives would increase the amount of receipts from what the counties would have received in 2012 if their payments had been based on timber receipts; Alternative C would generate the most receipts, followed by the 'no action' alternative, Alternative B, A, and then Alternative D generating the least receipts. Richard noted that, for the purpose of the analysis, they included the Coos Bay Wagon roads in the O&C payments, although in practice there is a different calculation for payments from these lands.

- Comment: It would be helpful to show the historic payments to counties in constant dollar values.
- Comment: It would be helpful to clarify for the public the difference between 'no action' and current conditions – it could be confusing to the public why BLM is not just implementing the 'no action' alternative.
- Comment: When talking to public it will be important to mention the certainty and ability to implement the action alternatives compared to the 'no action' alternative.

Costs to BLM

The costs to BLM were analyzed at District level and addressed how much the alternative would cost the BLM to implement? The 'no action' alternative increases the BLM budget by 29%; Alternative C requires the largest budget increase to implement, followed by Alternatives B and A. Alternative D requires less money to implement than the current conditions. These costs are driven partly by timber and other resource management approaches.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments regarding the costs to BLM analysis:

- Q: Are these numbers in addition to the current budgets?
 - Response: No, this is the expected annual cost to a Districts' resources and staff; it shows what they will need in order to operate their programs.
- Q: Does the economic analysis break out the Coos Bay Wagon Roads?
 - Response: The IDT assumed that the Coos Bay Wagon Road payments are going to follow the same kinds of patterns of change as the O&C payments, because the Coos Bay Wagon Road payments are difficult to predict directly based on their unique formula.
- Q: Do you track the public domain revenues?
 - Response: Yes.

Process for Identifying the Proposed Alternative

State Director, Jerry Perez, reiterated that per NEPA planning requirements, BLM is required to identify a preferred alternative as part of the Draft RMP/EIS. Jerry stressed that the BLM is considering the preferred alternative to be a short lived decision, and does not necessarily reflect decision makers' ideas for the Proposed RMP. He also noted that there is likely not an 'ideal' alternative for anyone. Richard Hardt noted that it is particularly difficult to identify a preferred alternative with this plan because the IDT specifically avoided creating the typical range of BLM alternatives (maximum protection ranging to maximum extraction). Instead, the IDT worked to develop options that allow decision makers to choose from a range that shows what approaches produce what outcomes. Jerry asked the CAAG to help communicate the message that the preferred alternative is a short lived decision and does not indicate the direction that BLM is planning to take, it is simply fulfilling a requirement to state the 'preferred' alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS.

In regards to the Proposed RMP, Jerry asked the CAAG to start thinking about what outcomes their agencies want to see from this plan. Jerry reminded the CAAG that the Proposed RMP can be made up of aspects of various alternatives, and pointed out that with this suite of alternatives there are a lot of different ways to build the Proposed RMP. Jerry referred to his early analogy comparing the RMP process to the U of O Ducks game, stating that in the 2nd half of the RMP process, BLM would like to have robust conversations with the CAAG to determine what final outcomes are desired. Mark Brown noted that public input will be solicited to weigh in on the development of the Proposed RMP.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments around the proposed alternative and draft EIS:

- Q: What is the window for CAAG involvement on developing the Proposed RMP?
 - Response: Right now the first priority will be getting ready for release of the draft EIS and public outreach. The conversation on what the proposed alternative looks like can begin as soon as this spring/summer. Mark Brown agreed to provide a timeline for CAAG involvement the next time that CAAG reconvenes. It is expected that the CAAG will meet again before the release of the Draft RMP/EIS.
- Q: When is the internal BLM review process for Chapter 3?
 - Response: Internal review of Chapter 3 will be kicked off this week and will be complete some time in January.
- Q: How is CAAG going to deal with the Proposed RMP? How can we get CAAG to a place where all members are behind the proposal and interests are met?
 - Response: That is exactly what BLM wants to achieve; this conversation will be started early so that the CAAG has time to get to a place where everyone knows where the areas of agreement and disagreement are, and we can hopefully arrive at consensus.
- Q: How does the Washington Office, Secretary of Interior's Office, and solicitors' input feed into this process?
 - Response: A lot of this is going to be figured out as we go; however, to avoid conflicts, there will continue to be consistent briefings to D.C leadership. Often when Jerry and Mark go back to D.C., the questions from leaders are around how the cooperators are feeling about the process. Thus these conversations at CAAG are vital.
- Q: Will you plan to brief the Congressional Delegation?
 - Response: Yes, this briefing is in the works. We are trying to figure the timing, as we need to brief BLM leadership first.
- Q: When will the Draft RMP/EIS be released to the CAAG?
 - Response: It will be released to CAAG and the public at the same time, as soon as it is complete.

Wrap-Up, Next Steps & RMP Schedule

Mark Brown shared that the BLM is hoping to release the Draft RMP/EIS in April 2015; the release will be followed by a 90-day formal public comment period and public outreach effort.

CAAG members had the following questions, clarifications and comments around the RMP schedule and outreach:

- Q: Will there be an outreach dry-run for CAAG prior to public outreach?
 - Response: BLM would greatly appreciate if CAAG would agree to another outreach dry-run. Likely about a month before release of the draft.
- Q: What is the vision for public outreach at this point?
 - Response: The BLM PAOs are starting work on an outreach vision today, the CAAG Outreach workgroup will be convened in the next week or so, and once ideas are outlined they will share a plan with CAAG for input.

Jerry thanked CAAG members and others present for their dedication to this process and ability to stay present for the two days of presentation. He acknowledged the BLM team for all of the hard work that they have put into the RMP effort so far. Jerry reiterated that two years ago when he started on this process he articulated three goals,; he wanted to change the dialogue, talk about outcomes, and create a sustainable change that is predictable. He noted that the collaborative effort with CAAG, the public, and other interest groups is invaluable and this team effort will pay off with a plan that takes multiple interests and needs into consideration.

All present expressed appreciation to Richard and Mark for taking time to share these details with CAAG, and with that the meeting was adjourned.

** This summary is provided by the DS Consulting Facilitation Team; suggested edits are welcome and can be sent to Emily Plummer at emily@dsconsult.co. **