



Preface

Reader's Guide

This draft environmental impact statement is designed to provide a logical progression of information to the reviewer. The summary, five chapters, and appendices explain the management purpose and need being addressed, the scope of the issues involved, the alternatives designed to address the purpose and need, a description of the current biological and physical environment, and an analysis of the anticipated environmental consequences resulting from the implementation of any given alternative.

The progression of information in this document starts with a summary. The *Summary* chapter presents a digest of the document. Descriptions of the No Action Alternative and each of the three action alternatives are presented in enough detail to explain each alternative's overall management strategy for achieving the purpose and need, and to explain its associated land use allocations and management direction. The *Summary* also includes a comparison of the major land use and resource allocations and actions by alternative. For the purpose of brevity, the summary relies heavily on the use of graphics and brief descriptions of rather complex topics. Also for the sake of brevity and simplicity, the citations, references, and definitions included in the main text are omitted from the *Summary*. Therefore, the details provided in the five chapters of the document are needed to fully understand the alternatives and their effects.

Chapter 1 presents the purpose and need for the revision of the western Oregon resource management plans. Central to these plan revisions is the interplay between the laws directing or influencing the management of the BLM's O&C lands in western Oregon and the various legal precedents and opinions that guide the implementation of various laws. This chapter contains a more detailed discussion of these laws and legal precedents than is normally found in an environmental impact statement in order to help the reader clearly understand the purpose and need and the five major issues identified for analysis. This chapter also describes the planning area, the past management of the O&C lands, the planning process, and the involvement of local, state, and other federal agencies that are collaborating in the preparation of the plan revisions. Finally, this chapter identifies the seven recognized tribes within the planning area that are engaged in government-to-government relationships with the BLM.

Useful comments regarding Chapter 1 include whether the purpose and need require clarification or further explanation.

Chapter 2 presents the three action alternatives. The No Action Alternative would continue management under the current resource management plans (refer to the 1995 resource management plans for the districts of Salem, Eugene, Roseburg, Coos Bay, and Medford, and the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District). The action alternatives consist of a range of management approaches or strategies that are designed to meet the purpose and need and to resolve the planning issues. The alternatives consist



of management objectives, management actions, and land use allocations. Two of the action alternatives are based on a network of managed reserves that allow intensive timber management outside of the reserves. The other action alternative minimizes land use allocations and manages timber across the landscape on a long rotation to provide older forest habitats. Certain management objectives and management actions vary by alternative, while others are common to all three action alternatives. This chapter also describes the six subalternatives (variations of the three action alternatives) that were set forth to examine certain questions raised by the public and BLM managers. Finally, this chapter describes the alternatives that would not meet the purpose and need and, as a result, were not analyzed in detail.

Useful comments regarding Chapter 2 include:

- *Are the alternatives adequately and clearly described?*
- *Is it clear why some alternatives were eliminated from detailed study?*
- *Are there alternatives that appear to meet the purpose and need that are not included in the detailed study?*

Chapter 3 presents the existing condition and trends of the resources and programs within the planning area that would be affected by implementing the alternatives. Understanding the affected environment serves as a baseline against which to measure the potential effects, including the cumulative effects, of implementing an alternative. The description of the affected environment also provides the information necessary to understand the analysis of the environmental consequences in *Chapter 4*.

Chapter 4 presents the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from the implementation of individual action alternatives and subalternatives. The effects of the alternatives on the various resources are compared and contrasted against each other and against the No Action Alternative. This chapter also includes brief discussions of the use of models and the assumptions used in analyzing the alternatives. Adverse affects that cannot be avoided if the alternatives were to be implemented are disclosed, and mitigation is identified. A brief summary of the environmental consequences are located in the *Summary* and in *Chapter 2*. However, as in any overview or summary, detail is sacrificed for brevity; therefore, the information in *Chapter 4* needs to be read in order to fully understand the effects.

Useful comments regarding Chapter 4 include:

- *Are the conclusions clearly stated?*
- *Are the conclusions supported by evidence, analysis, and logic?*
- *Is there information included that appears to be unnecessary and gets in the way of understanding?*

Chapter 5 presents information on the consultation and coordination that occurred in the preparation of this draft environmental impact statement. The public involvement, cooperators, and preparers are identified. Reference information and a glossary of



words and terms that are not in common usage are included. In addition, future actions, such as the consultation on species listed under the Endangered Species Act, adaptive management, and plans for monitoring, are discussed.

Commenting

Well-written comments can be the most important contribution from citizens. It is the goal of citizen involvement to help the agency make better-informed decisions. Comments should be clear, concise, and on point. Comments that are solution-oriented and provide specific examples will be more helpful than those that simply oppose or support a particular alternative or position.

Numerous comments that repeat the same basic message of support or opposition will typically be responded to collectively. General comments that simply state that an action will have significant environmental consequences may not help the agency make a better decision unless the relevant causes and environmental consequences of concern are explained.

When providing comments, it is most helpful if you:

- Reference your comments to a chapter, subheading, or page.
- Locate errors in the analysis that had been performed.
- Provide new or missing information that would have a bearing on the analysis.
- Locate misinformation that may have been used and could affect the outcome of the analysis.
- Suggest a different way to combine the features from the analyzed alternatives.
- Suggest a new alternative that meets the purpose and need.

Comments received in response to this draft environmental impact statement, including names and addresses, become part of the public record and are available for public inspection. Comments, including names and addresses, may be published as part of the final environmental impact statement. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment (including your personal identifying information) may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so due to limitations under the Freedom of Information Act.

If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review, or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comments. Persons requesting such



confidentiality should be aware that, under FOIA, confidentiality may be granted in only very limited circumstances, such as to protect trade secrets.

Comments can be mailed to:

Western Oregon Plan Revisions
P.O. BOX 2965
Portland, OR 97208

You can also make comments online at the following website:

<http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/wopr/index.php>

Your comments must be postmarked before November 9, 2007.



Abstract

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Revision of the Resource Management Plans of the Western Oregon Bureau of Land Management Districts

1. Responsible Agency: United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
2. Draft (X) Final ()
3. Administrative Action (X) Legislative Action ()
4. Abstract: This draft environmental impact statement has identified three action alternatives for managing approximately 2.6 million acres of federal land, which is mostly revested California Railroad and Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Lands Act lands (i.e., the O&C lands), within the approximately 22 million acre western Oregon planning area. The BLM intends to revise six resource management plans with this single draft environmental impact statement.

Public comment played an important role in shaping the alternatives, which are described and analyzed in this document.

- The No Action Alternative maintains the decisions in the current resource management plans.
- Alternative 1 creates late-successional management areas that are similar to the large late-successional reserves in the No Action Alternative, applies new criteria for designating the width of riparian management areas, and provides for intensive timber management in other areas.
- Alternative 2 designates late-successional management areas based on the habitat requirements for the northern spotted owl and the marbled murrelet, applies new criteria for designating the width of riparian management areas, and provides for intensive timber management in other areas.
- Alternative 3 manages most of the land base for timber production under long rotations, or uneven-aged management in fire-prone ecosystems, in order to provide late-successional habitat across the landscape and also to provide for timber production.

Six subalternatives, which are variations of the three action alternatives, are also analyzed in this document.



The major resource management plan issues include:

- Providing a sustainable supply of wood and other forest products as mandated by the O&C Act, while also meeting the requirements of other applicable laws.
- Providing for the conservation of species that are listed under the Endangered Species Act.
- Contributing toward meeting the goals of the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act.
- Reducing the risk of wildfires and integrating fire back into the ecosystem.
- Providing for off-highway vehicle management to meet that demand while protecting other resources.

This document acknowledges the primacy of O&C Act in regards to the management of timber resources. Therefore, specific changes to the current management direction for areas of critical environmental concern and research natural areas, scenic values as identified through a visual resource management inventory, and sensitive species protection are proposed across the alternatives.

5. Date comments must be received: November 9, 2007

6. For further information contact:

Alan Hoffmeister
Bureau of Land Management
Western Oregon Planning Revision Public Outreach Coordinator
P.O. Box 2965
Portland, OR 97208

Telephone: (503) 808-6629
E-mail: orwopr@or.blm.gov