

Alternative Screening Process

I have been talking to a number of people concerning the screening process for alternatives. I spoke to Bruce Rene from the Regional Office, he said the IDT has a wide range of discretion in identifying a reasonable range of alternatives. The screening process needs to focus on how the alternatives address the situation statements (issues). He suggested single situation (issues) alternatives be dropped from detailed consideration if the other alternatives displayed reasonable and different ways to address the same situations. Fred Norbury from the Regional Office, said at this point, we need to focus on the issues not outputs or effects analysis, the EIS will rigorously explore outputs and environmental effects. The IDT has developed the following proposed process for screening alternatives:

1. Each alternative will be reviewed by the IDT in an open meeting, authors will be asked to give the overviews. Significant rationale about each alternative will be documented to display similarities and differences between alternatives. Authors will identify if additional background work is necessary (ie. Consult with entomologist on bark beetle infestations, consult with wildlife biologist on bear habitat).
2. Each alternative will be subject to a cluster analysis. The analysis will be used as a tool for identifying similar alternatives that could be grouped or combined. The authors of each alternative will be consulted prior to combining alternatives.
3. Each alternative will be summarized in a table that displays acres/miles by category, prescription and activity.
4. Each alternative will be reviewed to determine how they address each situation statement. Alternatives may be grouped according to how they address the situations.
5. Each alternative will be subject to a risk analysis (this will identify the potential risk of each alternative failing to meet each interest).
6. Each alternative will be reviewed to mix and match alternative components. This is a check to see if the situations could be addressed in a different way if components of alternatives are combined. This step in the process could help people identify ideas used by other authors that could/should be combined into new or current alternatives. At this time, partial alternatives will be developed into complete alternatives.
7. Review public comments to ensure we have a range that displays the interests.
8. Each new or modified alternative will be run through the above screens.
9. Each alternative will be reviewed in a subjective analysis to help determine a reasonable range of alternatives. This is the first step where a recommendation for screening will take place.
10. The IDT will develop a recommended range of alternatives for Dave Gibbons based on the above information.
11. The IDT will present Dave Gibbons with the recommended range in an open IDT meeting.
12. The IDT will review the recommended range with other agencies, tribal governments, the public and other landowners.

13. Dave Gibbons will decide on a range of alternatives in an open IDT meeting.

The following are proposed operating principles:

- The status of all alternatives will be displayed on the web page, as follows:

| Alternative # | Author | Recommended Status | Rationale |
|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | IDT | Dropped from detailed consideration | Combined with Alternative 2 |
| 2 | Joe Anderson | Dropped from detailed consideration | Author withdrew alternative |
| 3 | Henry Smith | Under Consideration | |

- Authors may choose to modify their alternatives throughout the process although the changes will be subject to rescreening.
- All major alternative decisions will be posted in the Current Events section of the web page. Reasons for eliminating alternatives will be documented in writing.
- Any "New" alternatives will be run through the screening process and addressed in open IDT meetings.