Forest Service Plan Amendments phone hearing: 1-5 p.m. Forest Plan Amendments – 15 site specific land locations. Worked cooperatively with FERC and BLM to create requirements that would reduce, avoid or minimize impacts. F-10 attachment

David Krants FS explained scope: Narrow decision – project specific amendments relating to late successional reserve plan amendment reallocations. Project spec. – will only take effect if project goes forward. If they are related to forest service planning rule requirements: sustainability, timber requirements, multiple use and plant and animal. These amend have triggered the requirements. Appendix F - F-2 FS analysis, F-11 Draft Record of Decision.

1:20 Andy Stahl: Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics – Suggested resolution is to develop an alternative that avoids National Forest System Lands, not just an alternative that avoids federal lands and to comply with the National Forest Management Act. Says relevant FS plans in this are arbitrary and don’t meet Forest. False to think that FS lands need to be crossed. NFMA (National Forest Management Act). The law says that plans and permits, contracts, etc. for use and occupancy of NF lands must be consistent with the Management plans. No rule says this has to be accommodated. Regulated and restricted by the NFMA. FS concurrence is an instrument. 2 kinds of decisions: concurrence by FS and a ROW permit by the BLM. Both have to be consistent with use and occupy of FS lands. NFMA regulates BLMs behavior as well when they are making decisions (issuing instruments) for regulations on NF lands. Since this pipe could NOT go on FS land, this process is unnecessary. Did not event look at option of not going on FS lands.

Mineral leasing act – Not intended to diminish authority of each agency when multiple agencies involved, but to ensure applicant didn’t have to go through many different agency processes. (Alice Carlson – head of FS project. Thinks this is an important step and part of her responsibility. Concurrence isn’t simple because it includes all of the issues involved under forest plan.

2:00 pm Susan Jane Brown (SJB) – Western Environmental Law Center, Doug Heiken - Oregon Wild and Francis Eatherington - Oregon Women’s Land Trust , Deb Evans (affected land owner)– Suggested resolutions include: • deny the request by the proponent; • develop a proposed action that is consistent with the existing land use management plans (including consistency with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS)), citing the 2012 Planning Rule (81 Federal Register 90,725-90,726), which the objectors state prohibits agency actions that seek to exempt a project from forest plan requirements; • prepare forest plan amendments that comply with the 2012 planning rule; • or prepare a new/supplemental EIS that meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and more fully considers the potential for cumulative impacts to affected resources.

SJB wanted to clarify what is to be accomplished on March 23. Debbie Anderson: Regulatory requirements to respond to the objection filing period. We’ll get a letter with attachment with objection issues on the 23rd. They want to combine response to 218 and 219. Raised issues that there are a number of forest plan violations that were not cured by a forest plan amendment. Since an objection response is due on Mar. 23. Does that mean you won’t be offering other Plan amendments in the interim? Response: Debbie: They are working on that response (9 additional FP amendments that enviros think they should undertake. Can BLM override FS decision? Dept. of Interior (and Agriculture) if we can reconcile with BLM. We don’t have a decision, we have concurrence.

Francis: No project mitigation for specifically fire impacts on FS lands from this project. Pipeline will have a young forest on either side, which is far more susceptible to burning. Very concerned about increased fire risks that EIS refused to address. Class I area – pipes can be thinner and are buried on shallower holes (18”). Block valves are on FS lands – not automatic shut offs. Heavy equipment works on ridgetops. Just idea of being in Class I area, upset that FS didn’t require class 4 specifications. Douglas county asked for that. Should also ask for automatic shutoff valves. Worried that slash piles that FS will allow to remain to prevent ATVers from driving over pipe. Did not analyze impacts of slash pipe burning. Would cause pipe to lose very much methane. Suggestions were a joke: thinning and fuel breaks. We know those don’t work. Boring under the PCTS wasn’t discussed in the alternatives description, so can you throw it in there now? Response: It was disclosed in the Draft EIS and in the final.

Alice – Good articulation of your thoughts around issue. You suggest mitigations not enough and we should deny or have new EIS. Debbie Anderson – Are you suggesting an additional amendment to address this? Do you just want better protections? Frances: Yes. Protections for wildland fires.

Deb Evans, Affected Land Owner and member of Hair on Fire, Oregon. 157 Acres of timber on Clover Creek Rd (near Dead Indian Memorial). Bought land from a timber Co – no one said anything about a pipeline, then flagging showed up. 1 mile from Mountain Lakes Wilderness. 15-year fight. Fire is our #1 concern. Higher temps and less moisture are making our timber struggle. Introduce a pipeline with a 95’ swath and you have even more threats. Visual qualities will be harmed. Supposed to be a utility free corridor (Dead Indian Rd?). They are organic produce growers in Jackson Co. She is a volunteer FF for Greensprings Fire Dept. Sparks were going ½ mile in front of the fire so a 95’ fire break is “a joke:. EIS says revegetation will take as long as 20-30 years. You are introducing this danger that affects everyone along the route. We are near the PCT. Trail comes through their property. (its an easement). EIS not clear that it will be HDD’d (horizontal directional drill) or not. Don’t know that there is a market for this gas. No contracts. Has concerns over routing and FEIS wasn’t clear on Blue Ridge routing alternative. Are alternatives written for this route? FS does not have knowledge about what BLM will choose to do on the Blue Ridge variation.

Dave Krantz – Our role is to work with the company to reduce effects at crossings for recreational users including at Pederson Snow Park and in the trail corridor. Design a bore that will maintain forest qualities by collocating with roadway and boring under roadway to create natural screening. 200-300 feet on each side. This is the preferred alternative. Also, co-located pipe in alignment with road to reduce impact. Looked at different routes but that ran into Lake of Woods and expanded Cascade Siskiyou NM. Someone mentioned that they are curious about whether Mineral Leasing Act applies since it’s a foreign company. Dave: Really a question for BLM.

Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild: Confused about scope of FS’s discretion. Thought they were on a short leash determined by FERC. Later, it sounded like they have more independence? Mineral Leasing Act says its governed by Dept. Of Interior when there are multiple federal landowners. Concerned about impacts on streams and fish, slope stability, serious problems with habitat, loss of old growth, issues of creating more edge and more ladder fuels along the clearcut right of way. Infrastructure being put in that would require aggressive fire response. If it violates current Forest Plan, then it should be denied. Is there a process FS has with BLM to engage with BLM on Minter leasing Act? BLMs 43CFR, through the EIS process (avoid, minimize, mitigate). Wants FS to have strong independent authority on this to deny, but there’s a complex dance between FERC, BLM, FS, does not provide solace.

2:45 pm George Sexton/Brodia Minter – Klamath Siskiyou Wildlands Center - Suggested resolutions include: • deny the request by the proponent; • develop a proposed action that is consistent with the existing land use management plans (including consistency with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS)), citing the 2012 Planning Rule (81 Federal Register 90,725-90,726), which the objectors state prohibits agency actions that seek to exempt a project from forest plan requirements; • prepare forest plan amendments that comply with the 2012 planning rule; • or prepare a new/supplemental EIS that meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and more fully considers the potential for cumulative impacts to affected resources.

Doug Heiken: Is the process really set up to come to a resolution? Neighbors on Freemont Winema, Six Rivers etc., want to be more involved, work with and collaborate with agencies, private and public lands. Almost every watershed we work in has a team developing Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP). Objection/resolution process we are in now was first developed out of Hipra \_\_\_\_\_\_\_? Written by Congressman Walden. What we are doing today is not that – coming to an outcome that meets all of our needs. I would like to suggest that we could do better. Mostly concerns about process. No collaborative effort. Frustrating.

Brodia Minter: Site specific impacts in these amendments. Dredging estuaries, putting soils in streams, destruction of riparian reserves, fire hazards, decreases in visual quality objectives. This is not happening in a vacuum. Need to prevent Old growth habitat reductions. Can’t find in the record where the cumulative impacts of all of this is listed. Where does the totality of the site-specific amendments exist in your cumulative impacts analysis? Dave (FS): Chapter 4 looks at project impacts.

3:00 pm Jessie Ratcliffe – Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife – Suggested resolutions include: • develop a crosswalk between the federal land compensatory mitigation plan with the standards in the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife’s (ODFW) mitigation policy; • fully develop mitigation that is in-kind and in-proximity to minimize impacts to coastal marten, fish and big game winter range; • improve interagency coordination to design ways to avoid, minimize and mitigate the impacts of erosion and sediment transport into stream networks. • in order to properly assess whether the sediment abatement projects meet the rigor of fully mitigating for impacts, ODFW recommends complete information on the proposed project actions including at a minimum: o GPS location and detailed current condition of habitat function(s) or lack thereof; o Previous land management actions within the HUC 6 of the proposed project that are relevant to the proposed uplift; o Fish passage status of upstream/downstream reaches from the project area; and Future land management strategies proposed at the hydrologic unit code (HUC) 6 level watersheds that may affect performance of the project in the future.

Jessie: Question - still not clear on what FS thinks its decision-making authority is. Here’s what I think I’ve heard: BLM makes the decision on the right of way and FS has opportunity to consult/participate, but ultimately within BLMs discretion to decide. FS is also obligated to follow its own statutes and rules. Wondering if FS decides if Forest Management plans cannot be amended consistent with the law, in a way that would allow the right of way to be effective, and if Dept of Interior can amend its Mgmnt plan, then how does this affect FS Mgmt. Plan?

Alice: It is her belief: project as reflected in the DEIS allows her to make a decision that is consistent with forest planning laws. Analysis is complete and retains our stewardship in content and feels BLM will support and respects conclusions. I do not see this going to another level. Will continue to see the comments that have been made and will do what it takes to correct the content as needed.

Jessie: Sees a potential conflict between the BLM and Secretary of Interior’s decision if it conflicts with your decision and whether they can override you. What would you do? Alice went back to her previous statement. These are the obligations and authorities that I have. He feel slike we have had inadequate time, feels that to extent that we can continue talking about our concerns, we would like that.

Sarah Rice, ODFW. Project Will impact habitat for spotted owl. Irreplaceable habitat loss – need to avoid loss of late successional reserves around nesting activity centers. We reviewed non nesting areas, but it was not clear whether areas would be protected (…” may take decades to create conditions to create late successional reserves). Some areas did not have NEPA completed. Funding always an issue. What is the timing of that? Let’s continue to work together to resolve these concerns and issues.

3:15 pm Denise Tschann – DENISE was NOT THERE. suggested resolutions include: • prepare a project that meets the standards and guidelines of the existing land use management plan; or • deny the project

3:30 pm Melanie Plaut – Physician OBGYN. Suggested resolutions include: • prepare a project that meets the standards and guidelines of the existing land use management plan; or • deny the project or withdraw the project.

Not an expert on forest policy and not a lawyer, but am familiar with federal law. In federal regs, there is often gray area. Urge FS to take a broad and not a narrow view when you have an option, to protect neighbors and our lands. Public lands are central to our identity. In PNW it gives us a sense of place and anything that strikes at the heart of that diminishes our resilience and our commitment to play. Do not get stuck in the labyrinth of the regulations. I went to the BLM website. The title of the web page is “energy independence”. This project has nothing to do with energy independence: It is owned by foreign company and is about energy that would be shipped overseas. It contains only risks to our streams, fish, slopes, fragmentation of forests, etc., this all diminishes the quality of public lands that belong to all of us. Can’t eliminate the environmental consequences. Please deny and do not concur with what the BLM and FERC want to do. Hard to understand all of this without an advanced degree.

3:45 pm Eileen Fromer – Suggested resolutions include: • prepare a project that meets the standards and guidelines of the existing land use management plan; or • deny the project or withdraw the project. She is a member of the public. Forest Hiker, rafter, Visits Coos Bay. Two concerns: effects of clearcutting, which is a major driver of climate change. Largest clearcut in history would happen with this project. Loss of trees will violate Oregon’s regs on water temps, cross streams Little Butte, Sister and \_\_\_ Creek. Degrade fish habitat and water quality. Violates water quality standards, turbidity, temp etc. floods. Heavy equipment used in firefighting. Risk of fire in pipe locations. Concerns economically. Summertime explosion could be catastrophic. Methane exposure, erosion, methane that escapes warms the planet very effectively. Worse for climate change than coal if more than 3% escaping, which is the average that escapes now from pipelines. There have been 550 deaths from 9000 pipeline incidents over the past \_\_\_\_ years. Pipeline accidents are accelerating. No guarantee that Pembina will pay for the costs of restorations. Deny Pembina. Why should we allow them to put our lives in danger, destroy habitat and impair the economy?

4:00 pm Rianna Koppel – Suggested resolutions include: • prepare a project that meets the standards and guidelines of the existing land use management plan; or • deny the project or withdraw the project. Deny any Forest Plan amendments. Last year when FERC had a public comment period, they received tens of thousands of comments opposing the project. State of Oregon, Jackson County Commissioners, tribal, etc. FS only has so much sway to take this into consideration, but you need to have the history that folks really care about their public lands. Just say no to this foreign fossil fuel project. DSL had over 35,000 comments in opposition. Pembina withdrew their application. These are our public lands. Their clear water act permit was also denied. Coastal Zone Management permit was also denied. This history showcases the issues.

4:15 pm Katherine Bragg – Suggested resolutions include: • prepare a project that meets the standards and guidelines of the existing land use management plan; or • deny the project or withdraw the project. We should not make any exceptions to allowing this project through our protected land. Dangerous, leaking line through our lands, impacts to land, altered the environment it will never be the same. Short sighted that only benefits fossil fuel companies, and Asian countries who would burn the gas, further harming the climate. I hike, raft and camp in these pristine lands. We need to preserve and enhance protections and not lessen protections.

4:30 pm Deb McGee (requested less than 5 minutes) – Suggested resolutions include: • prepare a project that meets the standards and guidelines of the existing land use management plan; or • deny the project or withdraw the project. Lived in Oregon for 40 years. Loves the outdoors. Backpacks. K-12 public school educator and community health professional. Dedicating her life to stopping climate change. Last thing she wants to think about while hiking is a 36” pipeline filled with explosive fracked gas nearby. Object that my tax funded Forest Service will allow private corporate profits over my safety and public trust. Children are beginning to show stress of impending climate crisis. This is a horrible idea. We would be increasing fracking in other states at the same time that climate science is saying keep fossil fuels in the ground. Take a no action alternative or don’t allow it on public lands. Protect our public forest.

Thoma Devers: Oregonians feel like we’re being ignored on many levels. Why are we even having this conversation when Oregon has denied several permits? The cost of this analysis is expensive, too. You act like you’re going to listen to us, but it is determined by David Bernhardt (Sec of Interior). He has ethics violations that are being ignored and others (Daniel Jorjani) at the Dept. of Interior have perjured themselves. New FERC commissioner (R) but there is not a (D) for balance. This will create an imbalance. This is just wasting yours and our time. BLM was working with Pembina to spy on us (referenced Insight article). Sean Mole (OR Dept of Energy) still hasn’t received a statement from Pembina of how much energy they will generate onsite, which relates directly to the on-site blast zone, trying to determine the area of the blast zone. Bernhardt worked for the very same public relations firm that works for Pembina. Big conflict of interests. We also need evidence about whether there is terrorism danger? Salmon are having a difficult season. We are looking at a severe wild fire season. Wildfire impact was not listed in EIS.

Next Steps: Transcription will be posted on the Umpqua National Forest Page (MP3 file). Response to objections raised CFR218, will be signed on March 23. The 219 objections will go out no later than April 21. They will try to finalize both on the 23rd. Email will be cheaper so they will try not to send through post. Will group objections into themes, not one-by-one. Could be clarifications, could be additional instructions for further analysis, etc. We don’t know yet. Alice will make final “decision”.