

# **NEPA Memorialization**

Draft Document

6/30/2021

Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative

# Table of Contents

I.Introduction	3
II.Project Context	4
III.Project Engagement	4-10
IV.Areas of Agreement	11-12
V.Conclusions	12
Appendix A: Abbreviations and terminology	13
Appendix B: Sources and participants	14-17

# I. Introduction

Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative (OCCFC) formed in 2020 and is a group of stakeholders with diverse interests who work together with the Forest Service and other agencies around shared values of ecological health, economic opportunities and community well-being. The OCCFC works to improve the development, implementation, and monitoring of forest and watershed management projects that align with the values of the group. This Collaborative provides a space for open discussion and communication amongst stakeholders and agencies, while providing a platform for education and shared learning. Prior to the formation of the Collaborative, there were a number of land management projects that Collaborative participants were actively involved in:

1. Indian Creek
2. Deadwood
3. Sand Lake (ongoing at the time of this report)

This document summarizes some of the processes the Forest used to engage members of the public in those management projects, and areas of agreement and disagreement regarding the projects. These summaries will serve as a starting point for future collaboration and direct the Collaboratives process of drafting “zones of agreement.”

To compile these project summaries meeting notes and individuals involved in each of the projects were consulted for their perspectives and detailed explanations of the project process and areas of agreement/disagreement.

This document is not a history of the OCCFC as much of the public engagement and areas of agreement or disagreement only capture certain individual perspectives and occurred prior to the formation of the Collaborative.

This review is organized into three major sections. The first section provides a summary of each of the three projects. The second section provides detailed description of the public engagement related to each of the three projects, including summaries of the objection letters submitted. The final section explores the areas of agreement and disagreement related to each of the three projects.

Three major themes or concerns have emerged out of this review including:

- Concern over thinning practices for long term creation of late successional habitat
- Concern over thinning impacts on species including NSO and MAMU
- Concern that project goals will not be maximized resulting in less timber production

A glossary and list of people who attended meetings referenced in this document are provided in the Appendix.

To learn more about the OCCFC or to contact us about this document visit our website [at this link](#).

## II. Project Context

### Indian Creek Landscape Management Project

The Indian Creek scoping letter was sent out in December, 2015 and the signed decision letter went out in February, 2019. The project encompassed about 30,817 acres about fourteen miles northeast of Florence, Oregon. About 82 % of the project area is on National Forest land and 18% on privately owned land. The project addressed reduction and fragmentation of old-growth forests and habitat, shortage of habitat diversity in young stands, and shortage of high quality aquatic habitat. During the NEPA process, 4 meetings with the Adaptive Management Group (AMG) were held, and two formal comments were submitted. The primary issues brought up by stakeholders included: buffers, previously thinned stands, continued monitoring, roads, and use of herbicides.

### Deadwood

At the time of this draft, information about the Deadwood project is not available on the Siuslaw National Forest webpage. During the project process, 3 AMG meetings were held and a combined 8 formal comments were submitted during the draft and final objection periods. The primary issues brought up by stakeholders included: buffers, interior forest, carbon, roads, economic impact, maximization of project purpose, and the third alternative which was created with stakeholder input and proposed 145 acres of no-cut buffer in the project area.

### Sand Lake

The Sand Lake scoping letter was sent out in November, 2018 and at the time of this draft report the final EA objection period is still open. The project proposes about 2,600 acres of silvicultural treatments including about 100 acres of proposed early seral treatment within the Adaptive Management Area (AMA). At the time of this report draft 8 public comments have been submitted. During the process of this project the Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative (OCCFC) was formed and held one meeting regarding the project. At this time the primary issues brought up by stakeholders include the amount of early-seral treatment and buffers.

## III. Project Engagement

The Forest Service engaged with members of the public in a variety of ways related to the Indian Creek, Deadwood, and Sand Lake projects. Summarized here are the meeting minutes

for each of the meetings that the AMG held with the Forest Service as well as some of the public information and public meetings the Forest held. In addition to meeting summaries, this section of the document includes recollections of some of the small group and one-on-one communications that occurred for each of the projects. The goal of this section is to summarize the number of discussions that were had, the types of engagement provided, and the topics that were discussed related to each project.

## Indian Creek

The first documented meeting between the AMG and Indian Creek IDT was held in March, 2016. At this meeting D. Vogel pointed out that the IDT had spoken to the Siuslaw Stewardship Group, Alsea Stewardship Group, and the Marys Peak Stewardship Group and that Stewardship Group participants are invited to the monthly biologist meetings. D. Eisler suggested that AMG members are interested in helping to design a monitoring program, FS staff mention that the Forest has invested in a third party monitoring effort and M. Jones suggests that SG participants may not be aware of all monitoring done by the Forest. AMG participants request to see a report on all monitoring being done on the Forest to identify any gaps. There were questions about how the science discussed on field trips is applied to forest management, and there was discussion about how the Forest considers the scientific information it uses in management plans. There was some discussion about how Stewardship Group participants can be involved after NEPA is completed.

AMG met again in September, 2017 to work towards finding agreement and support for the Indian Creek project. AMG members had been assigned topics and FS specialists to meet with before the final EA moved forward. Topics included MAMU buffers, successional models, removal of young stands from consideration, gaps, and sectioning the EA project into smaller sections. There was also general interest in creating a working group on topics of interest including road issues.

In December, 2017 the AMG met with the Forest to continue discussing the Indian Creek project. Forest Supervisor, J. Ingersoll began the meeting by voicing interest in engaging people in project planning and policy, and pointed out that the intention and structure of AMG is unclear to the Forest. He continued on to state that there is value in identifying a structure for a forest-wide collaborative that could be involved in forest planning at the proper scales. During the meeting participants discussed thinning, woody debris, and MAMU buffers. Regarding thinning, gaps, and skips the group spoke about breaking up the clear-cut footprint, avian diversity that can be gained through opening areas and encouraging early seral, plan associations with three varieties of canopy cover, creating "chaos" at a stand level not only a landscape level, and where skips and gaps are placed in relation to buffers. Regarding large woody debris and snags the group discussed long-term recruitment, whether thinning is draining the available resources in future decades, concerns about the douglas fir bark beetle, a new data collection method used in the Deadwood EA that collects more data on the volume of downed wood, and the goal to mix treated areas with fewer snags and untreated areas with a lot of snags and downed wood. Regarding buffers, the FS said that they were in communication with Kim Nelson about a study with OSU. AMG requested to be involved in future EAs including

regular meetings with the IDT during the EA process. They identified that they need to spend some time figuring out the role of this new entity, engaging stakeholders, defining their purpose, and potentially seeking OWEB funds to support this work.

In May, 2019 the AMG met again to discuss what went wrong with the AMG process with Forest Supervisor, Robert Sanchez. It was suggested that the trust between AMG members and Forest staff was broken during this process due to lack of follow-through by FS staff on commitments including a list of follow-up work that J. Barth had circulated following the September, 2017 meeting, a question that that AMG could be involved in the pre-sale phase of timber operations when the sales were advertised, and commitments referred to in the Indian Creek EA resolution letter that have not yet been implemented. AMG members also felt that there was a general lack of responsiveness from the FS and that FS staff were hostile and complacent regarding AMG input. AMG participants voiced that they felt the Forest was not as committed to collaboration as it had been in the past and suggested that Forest staff watch the Saving the Forest video and read articles and books from Johnny Sundstrom and Jim Furnish. The AMG members continued on to say that they do not want to be obstructionist or shut down logging, but that they want the best science used for future EAs.

There were some notes from September, 2020 indicating that The Central Coast District Ranger suggested they would not release the Indian Creek EA until AMG was comfortable. However, it is unclear where these notes came from and in the same document there is mention that the draft EA was to be released the next week for public comment.

### **Objection letters:**

The Forest received two objection letters from members of the public including one letter from D. Artley on 8/5/2018 and one letter from P. Engelmeyer on 8/20/2018. D. Artley, a retired National Forest Planner primarily commented on the impact of new road construction, herbicide use, and action to reduce fire risk to homes. Additional Artley commented on the overall NEPA process.

P. Engelmeyer objected to the FONSI suggesting that 18 units were adjacent to MAMU and NSO habitat, road density targets were not incorporated into the plan, the EA did not address improving interior forest conditions, and that there were no no-cut buffers proposed. Engelmeyer requested the following resolutions: enhanced protection of occupied sites using buffers, no re-entry on 18 previously thinned stands, incorporation of recent research on thinning, minimization of clearcut near berry vegetation, retention of unthinned skips, fully funded analysis of current and legacy roads within the planning area, consideration of recent research regarding freshwater mussels, "rewilding" of portions of road to create interior forest conditions, development of a biological research and monitoring strategy within the SNF thinning program, prioritization of manual and mechanical controls over herbicides, and to reach out to adjacent landowners to create plans for buffers of occupied stands. Engelmeyer also stated that he was happy to see a restoration strategy for plantation forests.

The Forest held a formal resolution meeting in September, 2018. They identified 19 stands that had been previously thinned and were ultimately excluded from the Decision. They also state that they will identify and work with parties to coordinate monitoring efforts and to better communicate the use of science in NEPA. They also agreed to include maps of roads included in the project area, including those which were not part of the transportation system in the Decision Notice.

In November, 2018 the Forest issued its objection statement and response. They state that the 19 previously thinned stands were removed from the initial decision and a separate group will discuss treatment and issue a follow-up decision by mid-november. The statement also suggests that there was no incorporation of buffers into the final decision because they found adequate protection for both MAMU and NSO (EA pg. 65-67; Appendix E-1 pg. 23-27). The statement also instructs CCRD-ODNRA to work with interested parties to coordinate monitoring efforts and states ““Additionally the district would like to continue discussions formally or informally regarding current science and would like to work with you on developing a program or mechanism to better discuss new information and how the information could be applied to the forest.” The District states that connectivity and interior forest conditions were considered and documented in the EA (EA appendix E-2 pg. 24). The EA documents potential road impacts and the Forest agreed to include a map of existing roads in the final Decision Notice (EA pg. 149-152; Appendix E-1 pg. 7-8, 80-125). In response to the process related concerns brought up by D. Artley, the Forest states that all proper documentation and notices were provided.

## Deadwood

In July 2019 the AMG met with the Forest Service to discuss Deadwood project objectives, and share information about four key issues of concern that the AMG had related to the project. Key issue #1 was interior forest and MAMU habitat. Specifically, AMG was concerned that thinning young stands near MAMU habitat would increase the likelihood of predation and had an overall interest in creating and preserving interior forest. J. Oertey and L.Kerstetter explained the analysis previously done by the Deadwood IDT and showed a series of maps regarding NSO and MAMU. The Forest stated that they were going beyond USFWS requirements, but AMG remained concerned that the USFWS guidelines were not strong enough. OSU MAMU researcher K.Nelson and FS staff deliberated on whether there was conclusive research to confirm necessary width and density of buffers needed to protect MAMU from predators, and there was agreement that there is a need to test some buffers and monitor for benefit. There was some discussion about using the CP multi-party monitoring funds to do this work. AMG requested the IDT include some no-cut buffers along units across from interior forest habitat, and M.Jones said that the Forest was committed to considering no-cut buffers within the project area.

Key issue #2 was snags and downed wood. AMG participants felt that it is important for snag recruitment to be planned during the initial harvest. D. Heikken initiated this discussion with the FS and talked about the number of snags, proposed retention of snags, and how the Forest can manage for snags given fungus and climate change. The AMG did not make a specific request

related to this issue but there was general enthusiasm to come up with creative ideas. Key issue #3 related to stand level spatial heterogeneity. AMG participants were concerned that spatial heterogeneity had not increased or had reduced as a result of thinning based on multi-party monitoring done through Stewardship timber sales. AMG asked that the Deadwood project include internal gaps/skips, small tree clusters, and variable density thinning. H. Hoyt advised considering a larger landscape when analyzing spatial heterogeneity and M. Jones expressed a shared goal but existing constraints. The Forest was not willing to consider a marking crew to go out ahead of cutters due to lack of knowledge and expense. The final key issue was regarding roads but the group ran out of time to discuss the topic.

In September, 2019 the AMG met again with Forest Service staff to discuss the Deadwood project. The purpose of the meeting was to get a clear understanding of the no-cut buffers proposed in alternative 3 of the EA which were identified during a working meeting in July, 2019. C. Fisher walked everyone through each buffer and why they had been deemed appropriate. The analysis had been done using LIDAR data, road systems, visual screenings, and a 3-D exercise. Not all buffers were 300 feet-wide, the total acreage of no cut buffers proposed was 148 and it was determined that the proposed buffers would not have a major impact on logging. There was a general interest in looking into future planning to determine how buffers would be established in future projects and people expressed interest in monitoring for effectiveness of buffers over time. There was also interest in considering cross-ownership work and P. Englemeyer and C. Fisher mentioned that they would reach out to private landowners, the State, and BLM. It was mentioned that there are stakeholders with alternative perspectives in the project area. AFRC had submitted comments about clear-cutting in the Matrix, and Oregon Wild submitted comments about creating new age classes.

## **Objection Letters**

A combined eight letters were received during the draft EA and final EA objection period. G. Kennedy, A. Giesler, and M. Levin submitted comments on the Draft EA in March, 2020. P. Englemeyer, J. & E. Pattison, G. Kennedy, A. Giesler, and J. Kirchner submitted comments on the final EA in July, 2020. At the time of this draft report the Deadwood project is not available online and notes from the Forest resolution process are not included here.

G. Kenney, J. & E. Pattison, and M. Levin are all residents who live near the project area. They commented about concerns regarding the impacts to road conditions related to the proposed thinning, carbon impacts, consideration of NSO and MAMU habitat impact, socioeconomic impacts of the project, and specific plant species concerns. J. Kirchner from ODFW North Coast Watershed District submitted a comment regarding the decline in early-seral vegetation habitat for elk and other species and offered recommendations for treatment that would create this habitat. Kirchner also wrote in support of creation and enhancement of beaver habitat as well as implementation of large wood structures and maintenance of culverts.

In P. Englemeyer's comments submitted in July, 2020 he states support for the restoration strategy for plantation forests in the watershed, the effort to restore stream complexity, and the

reduced impact from roads. The letter mentions that BASI must be used and that scientific literature does not support thinning for interior forests and sensitive species protection. The letter refers to the 1997 MAMU recovery plan in regards to buffers, forest fragmentation, and interior forest habitat. P. Engelmeyer claims that the Forest may be violating Sections 7 and 9 of the ESA and that a FONSI is not justified for this project. The letter also references Alternative 3 (not selected) and mentioned that it was “created by a small group of community members and participants in the stewardship groups working with SNF, utilized this science to create no-cut buffers adjacent to the best ‘interior forest patches’ which would have resulted in 145 additional acres being set aside.” The recommended remedies listed include: creation of a no-cut buffer adjacent to MAMU stands, more conservation thinning on previously thinned units, and development of a road analysis that addresses priority road treatments.

A. Geissler submitted letters both in March and July, 2020. Both letters advocate for an emphasis on sustainable supply of timber products when appropriate. The letter speaks to LRMP as the only land where long-term sustainable timber management can be applied and mentions that some regenerative harvest will need to occur. The second letter speaks directly to Alternative 3 and states that the alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project which is to “restore terrestrial habitat, and increase patch sizes of late-successional forest conditions.” Geissler states that AFRC believes the goal is to meet the project objectives to the maximum extent which means that meeting project goals on 500 acres instead of 600 acres is inferior. The letter expresses concern with the scientific information used to designate the no-cut buffers in alternative 3 and offers that AFRC is happy to see that Alternative 2 was selected. A. Geissler requested that no elements of alternative 3 be incorporated into the project and that all objectors be invited to a joint resolution meeting.

## Sand Lake

In November, 2019 the Hebo Ranger District held a public Environmental Analysis meeting, open to more than just participants of the AMG. This meeting was held prior to the official scoping phase for Sand Lake and the Forest was looking for interest and input on trails, riparian areas, Elk movement, and mountain biking. During this meeting there was a dialogue on early seral treatments in the AMA. The limitations for this treatment in the AMA include: no gaps greater than 1 acre and no reduction of canopy cover below 40% or 30% outside of MAMU and NSO habitat with request to USFWS. When planning gaps, the Forest must consider the surrounding area of a gap and consult with a wildlife specialist considering the plants and animals that are in the area. The group also discussed large downed wood and how it is measured. A large herd of elk live in the Sand Lake project area and the USFS and ODFW proposed a partnership. The Forest also considered the impacts of mountain bike trails on the elk population in the project area.

In March, 2020 the Forest held a listening session for the Sand Lake Restoration Project. The Forest expresses that turnover has altered the project timeline. Based on the 2019 meeting the Forest heard a need to consider early successional treatment and interior forest. The Forest provided some research that shows that mountain bike trails may increase predation to MAMU

and that the trails may have impacts on other species. There were questions about the USFWS Consultation process that resulted in a future workshop series on the topic. During this meeting there was a more detailed conversation about trade offs related to canopy cover and thinning. There was a conversation about the definition of interior forest. The District Wildlife Biologist explained the analysis process used to consider MAMU habitat in the project area.

In December, 2020 the newly formed OCCFC coordinated a Sand Lake discussion for interested individuals. Because the Sand Lake NEPA process was underway before the Collaborative could fully form, the group decided to forgo participation as a full-group and instead encourage interested individuals to keep in touch with the IDT. During the meeting there was discussion regarding the number of acres that would undergo an early seral treatment in the AMA. The Forest described the process for choosing the 100 acres of AMA that would be treated and there were questions about ways to increase the amount of this type of treatment. That being said, other stakeholders expressed concern that reducing thinned acres in young stands to instead focus on early seral may lead to young stands aging out of being able to receive treatment. It was evident that further discussion about these tradeoffs is needed. In addition to the conversation around early seral treatments, some stakeholders were concerned about MAMU, buggers, and interior forest conditions in the project area. The Forest provided that they did an analysis to identify MAMU habitat and interior forest in the project area.

### **Draft EA Comments**

Because Sand Lake is still in the NEPA process at the time this report is being drafted, only the draft EA comments are available. They are summarized in this section. Eight objection letters were received during the draft EA objection period. T. Vander Heide submitted a letter in January, 2021 complementing the thoroughness of the EA and clarity of analysis provided.

Comments from A.Rasmussen, K. Hurliman, and T. Nelson mention concerns with the impact new recreation trail users might have on the project area. Concerns included enforcement capacity, infringing on natural areas, and parking as well as increased fire danger.

In D. Heikken's December, 2020 letter he writes that Oregon Wild generally supports variable thinning of dense young stands but that they question the purpose of early seral listed as economic benefit rather than an ecological rationale. He offers that the most significant need in the Oregon Coast Range is to restore late successional habitat and that cutting trees that might become large in the future is not necessarily worth the trade-off. A. Giessler writes for AFRC that they are glad to see vegetation management proposed in the AMA and riparian reserve land but that they are concerned about running out of available thinning in the LSR. He reiterates that they do not believe no-cut buffers are supported by science and they provide their own literature review on the topic. The letter also asks the Forest to reconsider the tradeoff of restricted harvest when there is likelihood but no observed NSO.

P. Engelmeyer & J. Liebezeit submitted a letter on behalf of Portland Audubon in December, 2020 that states that they felt many of their concerns had been addressed in the latest plan and that they support light thinning. Engelmeyer & Liebezeit request the following analyses: interior

forest conditions, relationship between thinning and predation, effects of treatment on dispersal of NSO, and existing forest connectivity. They also ask to see a description of the current road conditions and network and ask the Forest to use BASI that supports protection of the MAMU, NSO, and flying squirrel.

## IV. Areas of Agreement & Disagreement

### Indian Creek

Indian Creek was the first NEPA project that AMG engaged on as a group. Key issues that they had included: buffers, previously thinned stands, continued monitoring, roads, and use of herbicides. AMG also asked to be part of designing a monitoring process, and figure conversations about the use of best available science in NEPA. P. Engelmeyer submitted an objection letter on behalf of Portland Audubon asking the Forest to consider buffers and interior forest. The Forest pointed to existing analysis in the EA as sufficient response to this request. Meeting minutes and discussion suggest that agreement related to buffers and interior forest conditions emerged from the AMG at this point in time. Because Oregon Wild and AFRC did not submit objection letters for Indian Creek it is not clear where areas of agreement and disagreement exist amongst current OCCFC members. That being said, these concerns and topics carry forward in the Deadwood and Sand Lake projects.

### Deadwood

Similarly to the concerns raised in regards to Indian Creek, AMG raised key issues with Deadwood including interior forest and MAMU habitat, snags and downed wood, and stand heterogeneity. A key concern of AMG is that thinning adjacent to MAMU habitat will increase likelihood of predation. That being said, engagement on this project illustrates a difference of opinion about scientific evidence that this is the case. While AMG members suggest the Forest has not used BASI when considering no-cut buffers, AFRC provided it's own literature review supporting thinning in buffers. The Forest provided that it has gone beyond guidelines set by the USFWS regarding MAMU. However, the Forest agreed to hold a meeting with some members of the AMG in July, 2019 to carry out an exercise in selecting no-cut buffers. This exercise resulted in the creation of alternative 3 which proposed 145 acres of no-cut buffer within the project area. The District Ranger did not select this option and AFRC wrote in support of Alternative 2 in their objection letter. Here a clear area of disagreement emerges between some of the members of AMG and AFRC regarding no-cut buffers. AFRC provided that in order to meet the purpose and needs of the project, the Forest must carry out the full extent of whatever treatments are possible, this is to say that removing any acres from being thinned would mean the project does not fully meet its purpose and needs.

Many of the NEPA objectors for this project were local landowners. They brought different concerns to the Forest than those offered by current members of the OCCFC. It is important to consider local input and perspectives to these projects as the group works through zones of agreement in the future and more specifically when the group engages on projects.

## Sand Lake

Because of the existence of AMA in the project area, Sand Lake has provided a different set of interests, concerns, and tradeoffs amongst stakeholders than some of the other NEPA projects. Some of the OCCFC members who were previously involved in the AMG viewed the AMA as an opportunity for early seral treatment that would provide a unique habitat while providing increased timber in the project area. This was initially viewed as win-win amongst stakeholders interested in endangered species protection and timber production. That being said, it became clear during project engagement that there were some concerns from industry stakeholders that there would be a reduction of thinning in young stands to focus on early seral treatment which could be logistically challenging to log and may allow for younger stands to age out of ability to be thinned at a later time. These tradeoffs have not yet been fully explored.

Similar concerns about buffers and interior forest were raised from previous AMG members and AFRC contributed similar comments in opposition to these types of treatments based on different interpretations of best available science on the topic. The wildlife biologist did spend time during a meeting with the public explaining the analysis process for MAMU in the project area which helped to increase a shared understanding of the project process. Still, there exists a difference of social values related to MAMU and differing interpretations of available scientific information on the topic. This will be an area to explore in greater detail.

In addition to concerns about silvicultural treatment tradeoffs in the project area, and differing perspectives on buffers and interior forest habitat, stakeholders also expressed interest in elk habitat and the impact of recreational trails in the project area. The OCCFC does not currently have any members specifically interested in Elk habitat or recreation and adding individuals with those perspectives may be necessary for input on future projects.

## VI. Conclusions

At this time this document is still in draft form. Collaborative members will continue to provide details on their perspectives of past NEPA projects and work together to identify areas of agreement and disagreement related to each of the three projects. In the coming months the OCCFC will use this document and discussions about areas of agreements to begin discussions about Zones of Agreements and about tradeoffs moving forward. While there is general support for restoration projects on the Forest, concerns over habitat, late successional conditions, and sustainable supply of timber are at the forefront of stakeholder interest and concern. This review also illustrates the need to include a more diverse range of stakeholders in the OCCFC to capture additional interests and concerns related to herbicides, recreation, fire risk, and climate change.

# VII. Appendix A

## Terminology and Acronyms

NSO - Northern spotted Owl

MAMU - Marbled Murrelet

USFS - United States Forest Service

SNF - Siuslaw National Forest

OCCFC - Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative

AMG - Adaptive Management Group

SWF - Science Working Group (later became the AMG)

EA - Environmental Assessment

NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act

USFWS - United States Fish and Wildlife Service

ODFW - Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

OWEB - Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

FONSI - Finding of No Significant Impact

BASI - Best Available Scientific Information

IDT - Interdisciplinary Team

**Individuals who participated in NEPA related meetings organized by the OCCFC, AMG, or USFS from 2016-2020 (Attendance at all meetings cited in this report can be found in this table)**

Dave Eisler	(AMG Core) Landowner, SSG	3/8/2016, 4/22/16, 5/24/2016, 12/13/2017, 11/13/2019, 6/11/2019, 7/16/2019
Marc Barnes	(AMG Core) IRM, ASG	3/8/2016, 4/22/16, 5/24/2016, 12/13/2017, 9/27/2019, 11/13/2019, 6/11/2019, 7/16/2019, 3/9/2020, 12/1/2020
Paul Engelmeyer	(AMG Core) Audubon Society, Wetlands Conservancy, ASG	4/22/16, 5/24/2016, 12/13/2017, 5/16/2019, 9/27/2019, 11/13/2019, 7/16/2019, 3/9/2020, 12/1/2020
Fran Recht	(AMG Core) National Fishers Marine Service, ASG	4/22/16, 5/24/2016, 5/16/2019, 6/11/2019, 7/16/2019
Jon Porier		3/8/2016, 4/22/16
Jeff Uebel	SNF, Natural Resource Staff Officer, Corvallis SO	3/8/2016, 4/22/16, 5/24/2016
Donni Vogel	Natural Resources and Planning Staff Officer (Deadwood EA IDT)	3/8/2016, 4/22/16, 12/13/2017, 6/11/2019, 7/16/2019
Michelle Jones	SNF, District Ranger, Central Coast RD, Waldport (Deadwood EA IDT)	3/8/2016, 4/22/16, 5/24/2016, 6/11/2019, 7/16/2019
Karen Fleck-Harding		3/8/2016
Guenther Castillion	SNF, Silviculturist	5/24/2016, 12/13/2017
Amy Kouchupak		5/24/2016
Jill Orteib		5/24/2016
Shawn Smith		5/24/2016
Doug Stank		5/24/2016
Doug Heikken	(AMG Core) Oregon Wild	12/13/2017, 7/16/2019, 12/1/2020

Todd Wilson		12/13/2017
Dave Veseley		12/13/2017
Jerry Ingersoll	Previous SNF Forest Supervisor	12/13/2017
Tere O'Rourke		12/13/2017, 6/11/2019
Deanna Williams		12/13/2017
Ken Ballard		12/13/2017
Mick Mueller		12/13/2017
Casey Hawes	SNF Wildlife Tech	12/13/2017, 9/27/2019, 7/16/2019
Howard Hoyt	Silviculturist (Deadwood EA IDT)	12/13/2017, 7/16/2019
Robert Sanchez	Current SNF Forest Supervisor	5/16/2019, 6/11/2019
Lisa Romano		5/16/2019, 6/11/2019
Jim Fairchild		5/16/2019, 11/13/2019, 6/11/2019, 3/9/2020
Chandra LeGue	(AMG Core)Oregon Wild	5/16/2019, 11/13/2019, 6/11/2019, 7/16/2019
Chuck Fisher	Stewardship (Deadwood EA IDT)	9/27/2019, 6/11/2019, 7/16/2019
David Orozco		9/27/2019
Karl Wangerin		9/27/2019
Alex Wickham	SNF Planner	11/13/2019, 6/11/2019, 7/16/2019
Paul Lulay		11/13/2019, 3/9/2020, 12/1/2020
Paul Atwood		11/13/2019
Brandon Hendrix		11/13/2019
Aric Devens	SNF Silviculturalist	11/13/2019, 7/16/2019, 3/9/2020, 12/1/2020

Jason Wells		11/13/2019
Josh Venti		11/13/2019
Cheryl Pouley		11/13/2019
Luke Haworth		11/13/2019
Joseph Youren		11/13/2019, 3/9/2020
Marty Wieshart		11/13/2019
Andy Geissler		11/13/2019, 3/9/2020
Michelle Dragoo	SNF Wildlife	11/13/2019, 7/16/2019, 3/9/2020
Eric Hayes		11/13/2019
Deborah Wilkens		11/13/2019, 6/11/2019, 3/9/2020
Kaitlyn Schwindt	SNF Hebo RD	11/13/2019, 3/9/2020
Adrianna Morales		11/13/2019
Casey Largent		11/13/2019
Adam Rasmussen		11/13/2019
Kim Nelson	OSU	7/16/2019
Lon Otterby	Sierra Club and former MPSPG member	7/16/2019
Trent Seager	SNW	7/16/2019, 12/1/2020
Jill Oertley	SNF Wildlife (Deadwood EA IDT)	7/16/2019
Laresa Kerstetter	SNF Wildlife (Deadwood EA IDT)	7/16/2019
Ian Yao	SNF GIS (Deadwood EA IDT)	7/16/2019
Bob Thurman	SNF Contracting (Deadwood EA IDT)	7/16/2019
Ron Sanders	SNF Roads (Deadwood EA IDT)	7/16/2019, 3/9/2020
Garrit Craig	SNF CCRD Deputy Ranger	7/16/2019

Chris Bogan	SNF Timber Operations	7/16/2019
Brendan Barton	SNF Contracting	7/16/2019
Josh Chapman	SNF Acting Hebo Ranger	7/16/2019
David Orozco	SNF Wildlife	7/16/2019
Emily Stranz	DS Consulting (Facilitator)	3/9/2020
Kate Isacksen	USFS Environmental Coordinator	3/9/2020
Chris Knutsen	ODFW	3/9/2020
Camden Bruner	SNF Hebo RD Wildlife Biologist	3/9/2020
Tasha Counts	SNF Hebo RD NEPA	3/9/2020
Angie Yost	SNF Hebo RD NEPA	3/9/2020
Morgan McCarthy	USFS Hydrologist	12/1/2020
Brad Pfeifer	Hampton Lumber	12/1/2020
Hannah Smith	SNF Hebo RD NEPA Planner	12/1/2020