

Appendix A - Issues, Concerns and Opportunities

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	A-1
Scoping Process	A-1
Public Participation	A-2
Alternative Development Teams	A-2
Citizens Participation Program	A-3
Biological Diversity Group	A-3
Social Impact Group	A-3
Briefings on the Draft Forest Plan and EIS	A-3
Consultation with Others	A-4
Consultation with Other Agencies and Indian Tribes	A-4
Other Consultations	A-5

Appendix A - Issues, Concerns and Opportunities

Introduction

The first part of this appendix summarizes the scoping process used to identify public issues, management concerns and opportunities. The second part summarizes the public participation strategy developed as part of the scoping process.

The implementing regulations for NEPA define scoping as "an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues" (40 CFR 1501.7). The Forest used a broader definition of scoping for this EIS. Scoping includes all public participation activities throughout the planning process, as well as the Forest's internal Forest Service actions to identify issues. Throughout this document, public issues, management concerns and resource opportunities are referred to using the term "issues."

Scoping Process

The planning process and analysis for this EIS follows NEPA and NFMA guidelines. The initial step in the planning process is to determine issues. This step, called scoping, has been ongoing since 1979 and will continue throughout the planning process. Scoping is accomplished through contacting Forest Service employees, members of the public and other agencies that could be affected by or interested in decisions made in the Forest Plan.

Scoping started in the fall of 1979. The Forest Planning Staff completed a review of comments from the public on the proposed management of the Forest.

These comments were from letters, newspaper and magazine articles, personal conversations and scoping input from past Forest planning efforts and projects. The comments identified issues, concerns and opportunities.

The Forest Planning Staff developed a mailing list of interested and potentially affected individuals and organizations, as well as Forest Service employees. Included in the list were other federal, state and local government agencies. The Forest Planning Staff prepared an Issues Report that summarized the issues. This report was mailed to those on the mailing list in December 1979 for review and comment.

In 1987, major wildfires burned large portions of the Forest, causing significant changes to the Forest inventory. Identified as part of the scoping for recovery projects were many new issues associated with the 1987 wildfires. These changes required such major revisions to the Draft Forest Plan and Draft EIS, the planning process essentially started again.

On April 1, 1988, a revised Notice of Intent to prepare a Forest Plan was published in the Federal Register.

The Forest Planning Staff developed a Public Participation Plan and revised the plan, as needed, throughout the planning process. Discussed below are the highlights of the Public Participation Plan. This Plan and its revisions are in the planning records at the Forest Supervisor's Office in Yreka, California.

The Forest Planning Staff prepared an Issue Response Form displaying the known issues. The issues came from three sources: 1) the issues listed in 1982 Draft EIS, 2) the comments on the 1982 Draft EIS and 3) the scoping comments on the 1987 wildfire recovery efforts.

In preparation for mailing the Issue Response Form, the Forest Planning Staff expanded the existing mailing list to include those who had submitted comments on the 1982 Draft EIS. Also included were those who had commented on the 1987 wildfire recovery projects.

The Forest Planning Staff mailed the Issue Response Form in April 1988 to the 655 names on the mailing list. The purpose of the mailing was to receive validation of the issues listed and to identify any additional issues. The Forest Planning Staff held a scoping meeting to identify any new public issues on April 25, 1988 at the Yreka Community Center.

The Forest Planning Staff conducted a content analysis in January 1989 on the issues identified at the scoping meeting and on the Issue Response Form. Members of the ID Team reviewed the 239 responses received (51 letters and 188 returned Issue Response Forms). The Forest Planning Staff read and numbered each response. Then the Forest Planning Staff highlighted each of the important points and gave a code to each, based on the content of the comment.

The responses contained 634 comments. The codes and the comments were then entered into a database. This database helped to sort and group the issues generated from the comments. The issues were tracked throughout the planning process.

Using the results of the content analysis, the ID Team developed an issues package. Each comment group identified in the content analysis was expressed as an issue, concern, opportunity, planning question or identified as outside the scope of the analysis.

By identifying issues outside the scope of the Forest Plan, the EIS then focuses on issues that can be resolved through the Forest planning process. The following questions were used as screening criteria to determine which issues were outside the scope of the Forest Plan:

1. Does the issue have a direct effect on land use or land-use patterns for the Forest?

2. Does the issue have an effect on the amount, type and quality of commodities, goods and services that are produced on the Forest?
3. Does the issue affect (directly or indirectly) one or more segments of the public in a manner that might result in public controversy?
4. Does the issue potentially affect the quality of the natural environment or socio-economic structure of the Forest's area of influence?
5. Can the issue be more effectively resolved through the Forest planning process, rather than through existing Agency processes, such as manual supplements or policy statements?

A list of the issues and the criteria that identified each issue as outside the scope of the Forest Plan are in the planning records. Copies of all the responses and the content analysis coding are also in the planning records.

The Forest Planning Staff incorporated the revised issue package into the "Planning Newsletter #1." The Regional Office reviewed and approved the newsletter in July 1989. The Forest Planning Staff then mailed the newsletter to the public in August 1989.

The mailing list now includes over 1,750 names of individuals, groups and agencies. The Newsletter's goal was to provide an update on the planning process and ask for feedback on the revised issues package.

Letters identifying issues continue to come in. They are reviewed and a copy is sent to the specialists on the ID Team responsible for the resources at issue. The ID Team members then consider any new issues in the analysis.

The significant issues are listed in Chapter 1. Chapter 2 explains how the issues helped to develop alternatives. A comparison of how each issue is treated, by alternative, can be found in Chapter 2. This comparison also shows how the resolution of the issues under each alternative would affect the PNV for that alternative.

Public Participation

Public participation is an essential part in Forest planning. The intent and design of public interaction is to: 1) broaden the information base on which land and resource management planning decisions are made, 2) assure that the Forest Service understands the needs, concerns and values of the public, 3) inform the public of Forest Service land and resource planning and activities and 4) provide the public with an understanding of Forest Service programs and proposed activities.

To accomplish this, several public participation techniques were used during the planning process.

One technique used was *fishbowl planning*. This allows members of the public to "see" and understand

the steps of the planning effort. The intent was to have an open and honest process, making everything available for public review. The purpose was to build trust in the planning process while determining if there are other solutions, information or techniques available. It also identified the expectations of various public groups and individuals.

The public was invited to *provide written comments* on public issues, and are also asked to review and comment on the Draft EIS and Draft Forest Plan. The purpose was to improve the product and to identify public expectations, concerns and opinions. The Forest Planning Staff provided information to the public through various mailings. (Refer to **Scoping Process**.)

Open houses provided information to the public on the planning process. Information on public expectations, concerns and opinions was obtained. The Planning Staff held a scoping meeting on April 25, 1988 at the Yreka Community Theatre. This open house was to help identify issues for the Forest planning process.

On July 17, 1990, another open house was held for employees and opinion leaders in the community at the Forest Supervisor's Office. This open house provided information on the planning process and the data base. Members of the ID Team and the Planning Staff were available to answer questions.

An open house for the same purpose was held for the public on July 19, 1990 at the Forest Supervisor's Office. These open houses provided each potentially affected individual the opportunity to ask questions, express concerns and react to what was proposed. They were also to make suggestions on the planning effort.

Presentations were made to groups and organizations to reach audiences that might not otherwise hear about the planning process. Members of the ID Team and Planning Staff gave presentations to civic groups, special interest groups and local government organizations. The planning records contains the dates of those presentations and the organizations to which the presentations were made.

Individuals with specialized knowledge provided their expert help to resolve as many of the issues as possible at specific steps in the process. The Alternative Development Teams, Citizen Participation Program, Biological Diversity Group and Social Impacts Group are examples of this public participation technique. Following is an explanation of what these various groups did, and who was involved in them.

Alternative Development Teams

Members of the local community with expertise in specific areas helped developed the alternatives. The Alternative Development Teams were composed of these individuals and Forest personnel. They worked together to develop multiple-use alter-

natives that would respond to the issues identified in the scoping process. The public members of these teams then remained involved throughout the planning process to review and refine the alternatives and to assure smooth communications.

A list of the public members and their areas of interest is included below:

Alternative A: Jim DePree, forestry, Audubon Society; Tom Fogarty, forestry, Timber Products Company.

Alternative B: Charlie Brown, silviculture, Fruitgrowers Supply Company; Peter Sturges, recreation, outfitter and guide.

Alternative C: Tim Burton, wildlife biology, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG); Chad Roberts, wildlife biology, Audubon Society; Steve Self, wildlife biology, Timber Association of California.

Alternative D: Tom Hesseldenz, fisheries, California Trout; Dennis Maria, fishery biology, CDFG; George Thackery, agriculture, Scott Valley landowner.

Citizens Participation Program

The Citizens Participation Program (CPP) was created to help increase interaction with the public. The main goal of the CPP was for CPP individuals and Forest employees to share information.

Those participating in the CPP reviewed the work completed to date with the help of Forest employees well-versed in the creation of the Draft EIS and Draft Forest Plan. This helped to create relationships of trust, credibility and openness.

While regular meetings were not held, products were offered or displayed to 233 individuals during January and February of 1992. The displays included alternative land allocations, timber regulation patterns and individual resource allocations to the participants. Analysis of various issue tracking indicators were used to compare the alternatives during presentations. A complete listing of the individuals who participated is available in the planning records.

Biological Diversity Group

A group of specialists helped define issues and key indicators for biological diversity. Special expertise was sought to determine how this fairly new issue area should be analyzed and addressed.

The group included Forest Service employees and members of the public. Forest employees involved were Barbara Holder, Barbara Williams, Mike Ford, Jim Benson, Kathleen Milne and Jack West. Listed below are the participants from other forests, agencies or private organizations.

Bruce Marcot, Research Ecologist, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station

Reed Noss, Conservation Ecologist, Private Consultant

Tom Atzet, Forest Ecologist, Siskiyou National Forest

Blair Csuti, Oregon Natural Heritage Program

Steve Daniels, Forester, University of Oregon

John Lehmkuhl, Research Ecologist, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station

Barry Noon, Research Biologist, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station

Chad Roberts, Conservation Biologist, Private Consultant

Carl Skinner, Research Forester, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station

Cindy Zabel, Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station

Gordon Reeves, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station

Miles Henstrom, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station

Frank Burch, Region 5, Forest Service

Dave Schultz, Region 5, Forest Service

Gregg Denitto, Region 5, Forest Service

Social Impact Group

Due to the expected impact of the Forest Plan on the local communities, a special group was formed to help develop issues and methods for dealing with social impacts. The group included Forest employees and members of the public. The Forest employees were Linda West, Mindy Collister, Mike Ford and Edith Asrow. Listed below are the public participants for this group.

Steve Daniels, Forester, University of Oregon

George Stankey, Forester, University of Oregon

Robert Lee, Forester, University of Washington

Elizabeth Varney, Siskiyou County Welfare-Social Services Division

Joan Smith, Klamath Alliance for Resources & Environment

Lonny West, local logger

Briefings on the Draft Forest Plan and EIS

The Draft Forest Plan and EIS were circulated in September 1993. Members of the planning staff made themselves available for meetings with groups or individuals to discuss or explain the Preferred

Alternative or any other part of the planning effort. Open houses were scheduled for the same purpose.

The offer to meet with interested parties and the open houses were publicized in the letter accompanying the Draft EIS and Forest Plan, in newspaper releases and in notices posted at local post offices and other community gathering locations. An open house was held from November 1 through November 4 at the Forest Supervisor's Office in Yreka. Open houses were also held in Happy Camp, Macdoel, Fort Jones and Orleans in November 1993. Briefings were conducted for several groups on request.

Consultation with Others

Consultation with Other Agencies and Indian Tribes

Consultation with other agencies, local government, local Indian Tribes and individuals has been constant throughout the planning process. One purpose was to get resource data concerning production and environmental trends. Another purpose was to identify potential conflicts with the plans of those agencies and to coordinate throughout the planning process. The consultation also helped identify potential consequences for the alternatives considered, including the preferred alternative.

The Forest consulted with the Karuk Tribe of California, the Shasta Nation, Incorporated and the Butte Valley Indian Council on an ongoing basis. The goals were to identify issues important to the Tribes, to gather data concerning important cultural resources, to identify Tribal objectives and plans and to keep them informed of progress in the planning process.

In 1988, the Karuk Tribe proposed an alternative for managing the lands on the Forest that they consider their ancestral territory. Portions of this alternative have been incorporated into the alternatives considered in detail.

During the Forest Plan development period, a Government-to-Government Agreement was finalized between the Karuk Tribe and the Forest. Meetings with the Karuk Tribe pursuant to this agreement concerned management of cultural areas and of forest products.

In addition to many individual contacts, the Forest held several public meetings to discuss various aspects of the Plan's development. These took place in Yreka, Etna, Fort Jones, Somes Bar and other locations. Contacts were so frequent that several interest groups and individuals tracked the project's progress each month and some even more frequently.

The Forest contacted county officials, city officials and planners in Siskiyou County frequently. The purpose was to discuss the issues and other planning particulars. The Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors had several briefings on the process and progress of the Draft Forest Plan and Draft EIS throughout the

planning period. In addition, many California and U.S. legislators have either made inquiries or been given briefings.

The Forest held several meetings to discuss specific questions about technical aspects of planning data. Representatives from the CDFG, CDF, California Department of Water Resources and the North Coast Water Quality Control Board attended these technical discussions. Several individuals from these groups also made special efforts to involve themselves individually in this process through the CPP.

Specific information on meeting dates and places, those in attendance and the topics discussed are in the planning records. Refer to the planning records for further details.

The following lists the Federal, State and local governments and agencies contacted.

- Butte Valley Indian Council
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
- California Department of Transportation
- California Department of Water Resources
- Cities of Yreka, Montague, Weed, Mt. Shasta, Dunsuir
- College of the Siskiyous
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Humboldt State University
- Jackson County Board of Commissioners
- Karuk Tribe of California
- North Coast Water Quality Control Board
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Oregon Department of Forestry
- Shasta Nation, Incorporated
- Siskiyou County Assessor's Office
- Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors
- Siskiyou County Economic Development Council
- Siskiyou County Planning Department
- Southern Oregon State College



University of California-Berkeley

University of California Cooperative Extension Service

USDA Soil Conservation Service

USDI Bureau of Land Management

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service

USDI Lava Beds National Monument

USDI National Park Service

Other Consultations

The Forest has also consulted with individuals, landowners, industry organizations, conservation groups and the 5 adjacent National Forests. The purpose of these formal and informal consultations was to gain input, keep those consulted abreast of developments in the planning progress and to improve communications and resource data gathering. Specific information on meeting dates, places and topics discussed are in the planning records.

