

Potential Issues from the Public Received During Scoping

Comments received from ODFW on September 16, 2004		
Comment	Significant Issue? Yes/No	If no- Reason for not considering it If yes- Create issue statement
During the late summer period cattle heavily utilize the elderberry to the point of breaking off whole limbs on the larger plants and breaking off all the limbs on the smaller plants. Elderberry is an important food source for band-tailed pigeons, grouse, mountain quail, black bears and other wildlife (p1).	Yes	Issue Statement: Cattle grazing on elderberry during the late summer period within the Long Prairie Allotment may impact the plant (including breaking off whole branches) and reduce the food source for band-tailed pigeons, grouse, mountain quail, black bears and other wildlife.

Comments received from BARK and ONRC on September 20, 2004		
Comment	Significant Issue? Yes/No	If no- Reason for not considering it If yes-Create issue statement
Suitability Concerned about the suitability of Long Prairie for grazing (p 1, para 3)	No	Already addressed in EA; already decided by Forest Plan
Water Quality/Riparian Areas: Comprehensive data needs to be collected and analyzed on aquatic conditions in North Fork of Mill Creek and Neal Creek in addition to wetlands and other riparian areas in the vicinity of the proposed allotment (p 2, para 3).	No	A hydrology/water quality analysis will be completed as part of the EA
Would like to see fencing of riparian areas and off stream stock watering (p 3, para 1).	No	Used to design the proposed action
The combination of cattle's preference for riparian areas and the importance of these areas for maintaining water quality accentuate the problems caused to water quality (p 3, para 2).	No	Addressed in effects analysis; proposed action designed to protect water quality
Concerned about sedimentation into streams (p 4, para 2-3).	No	Addressed in effects analysis; proposed action designed to protect water quality
Concerned about increased bacteria in streams from feces delivery (p 4, para 4-5).	No	Addressed in effects analysis; proposed action designed to deter cattle from streams

Comments received from BARK and ONRC on September 20, 2004

<p>Cumulative Effects: Concerned about the cumulative effects from logging, road building, mining, off-highway vehicles, development, noxious weeds, fires, and fire suppression; especially in terms of water quality (p 5, para 1).</p>	No	Will be resolved through the analysis in the EA; see Cumulative Effects sections for each functional group
<p>We are particularly concerned about how this proposal will impact fish species in the planning area (p 5, para 3).</p>	No	Will be resolved through the effects analysis and the design of the proposed action
<p>Livestock Capacity: Would like to see sensible and scientific figures for livestock capacity and stocking rates (p 5, para 4).</p>	No	Will be addressed through the effects analysis
<p>Native Species: Concerned about the impacts grazing will and has had on native species (p 5-6)</p>	Yes	<p>Issue Statement: Cattle grazing within the Long Prairie Allotment may have a negative impact on native botanical species, such as the <i>Botrychium manganese</i>, a Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, sensitive species. Cattle concentrated in meadows may trample and graze on these sensitive plants and have a detrimental effect.</p>
<p>Alternatives must include provisions for restoring damaged natural resources and native species populations throughout the allotment (p 6, para 1).</p>	No	Used to help design the proposed action
<p>There is credible evidence that deer and elk populations could be adversely affected by increased grazing (displacement) (p 6, para 6). Would like to see enough forage for wildlife</p>	Yes	<p>Issue Statement: There is concern that cattle grazing could decrease forage availability for deer and elk within the Long Prairie Allotment, causing them to become displaced.</p>
<p>This proposal will more than likely negatively impact migratory birds, which depend upon riparian areas that are likely to deteriorate as a results of grazing (p 7, para 1).</p>	No	Will be addressed in analysis; proposed action is designed to protect riparian habitat

Comments received from BARK and ONRC on September 20, 2004

<p>Monitoring: The USFS must make provisions in the proposed alternative for responsibly responding to information from independent monitoring of the allotment by citizens. If the FS is presented with violation information, the FS must take the necessary steps to immediately prevent further violations (p 7, para 3).</p>	No	The issue is a comment, opinion or position statement
<p>Would like to see adequate monitoring provisions and a map depicting the locations of all Designated Monitoring Areas (p 7, para 4).</p>	No	Monitoring provisions will be included as part of the analysis
<p>Soils: Concerned about impacts (compaction, reduced infiltration, interference with movement of water, run-off, erosion) from prolonged grazing to soils in the project area (p 7-8)</p>	No	Will be addressed in effects analysis and proposed action
<p>Trampling by large grazing ungulates compacts the soil, increasing bulk density of soil. The resulting lowered infiltration rates cause increased run-off and erosion (p 8, para 1).</p>	No	Will be addressed in effects analysis and proposed action
<p>The data of Kauffman et al. (in process), indicates that grazing has caused the loss of at least about 1.1 million ft³ in soil water storage per square mile of grazed area in wet sites, based solely on the measured loss of soil porosity (p 8, para 2).</p>	No	Will be addressed in effects analysis and proposed action
<p>Global Climate Change: Would like to see the NEPA document address the impacts of global climate change. Would like to see information about how fire and climate will interact on the landscape (p 8, para 4).</p>	No	Likely outside of the scope of the proposed action; difficult to examine from a project-level analysis
<p>Noxious Weeds: The effects of grazing are not localized, but affect surrounding areas due to the introduction of weeds. Cows wander out of designated areas, and the high road density and high recreation use also exacerbate the problem (p 9, para 2).</p>	Yes	<p>Issue Statement: Cattle grazing activities on the Long Prairie Allotment have the potential to disturb soil and create bare ground, which may facilitate the spread of existing noxious weeds.</p>

Comments received from BARK and ONRC on September 20, 2004		
It is not prudent to move forward with this proposed action before the sub-regional noxious weed EIS is completed; must address the effects of any pesticide treatment that is proposed under the noxious weed EIS <i>as a result of grazing in the area</i> (p 9, para 1).	No	This issue is outside the scope of proposed action. Effects to noxious weeds from cattle grazing will be analyzed in the EA
Allotment Retirements Would like to see the analysis explore the use of methods to accomplish conservation and restoration goals including retiring the allotment	No	This issue is outside the scope of this proposed action
Economics: The proposal must address the economic costs to the FS, Oregon, and all other public agencies resulting from grazing (including any restoration or subsidies)	No	Comment will be addressed in the effects discussion in the EA
The best interests of the public, the wildlife, and natural resource heritage of us all must be weighed against the often considerable financial and ecological costs of grazing on public land (p 10, para 2).	No	This issue is a comment, opinion or a position statement and is already decided by law, regulation, or Forest Plan or other higher-level decision
Conflict with Other Users/Aesthetics: Livestock grazing tramples and devastates what would otherwise be abundantly beautiful wildflower meadows and natural riparian wonderlands. Cattle despoil the landscape with their feces, which assault the olfactory senses, impair respiratory health, support a plague of disease-vector biting insects, and significantly limit the capability or desire of citizens to exercise their Multiple Use Act rights to recreate and enjoy public lands (p 10, para 3).	No	This issue is a comment, opinion or a position statement. Effects to recreation will be addressed in the EA