

RESULTS

Survey of Natural Resource Issues in the Columbia River Basin
of
Participants in the Eastside Ecosystem Management Project

SEPTEMBER 1994

John R. Tennert

William D. Schreckhise

John S. Briney

Division of Governmental Studies and Services
Department of Political Science
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-4870

Mark Brunson
Project Coordinator

Department of Forest Resources
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322-5215

ABSTRACT

This report details the findings of surveys of public involvement participants in the Eastside Ecosystem Management project. The purpose of the survey was to assess participant attitudes of management preferences concerning public lands in the Columbia River Basin.

The results of the survey are reported in four sections. The first section is a demographic analysis of respondents. The second section presents frequency distributions for each question. A third section is devoted to the Supplemental Survey which is exclusive to the participant survey. Finally, the fourth section entails a content analysis of comments, including all comments recorded verbatim from respondents in Appendix A.

Preface

The following report was prepared by University scientists through cooperative agreement, project science staff, or contractors as part of the ongoing efforts of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, co-managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. It was prepared for the express purpose of compiling information, reviewing available literature, researching topics related to ecosystems within the Interior Columbia Basin, or exploring relationships among biophysical and economic/social resources.

This report has been reviewed by agency scientists as part of the ongoing ecosystem project. The report may be cited within the primary products produced by the project or it may have served its purposes by furthering our understanding of complex resource issues within the Basin. This report may become the basis for scientific journal articles or technical reports by the USDA Forest Service or USDI Bureau of Land Management. The attached report has not been through all the steps appropriate to final publishing as either a scientific journal article or a technical report.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Abstract	i
2.	Section I - Survey Population and Response Rates	1
3.	Section II - General Survey Results	
	A. Section 1	4
	B. Section 2	7
	C. Section 3	10
4.	Section III - Supplemental Survey Results	29
5.	Section IV - Content Analysis of Survey Comments	37
6.	Appendix A - Comments	48
7.	Appendix B - Survey Instrument	172
8.	Appendix C - Item by Item Results	184

SECTION I: Survey Population and Response Rates

In July of 1994, a one-wave ANONYMOUS survey was sent to 2094 potential respondents drawn from the participant list of the Eastside Ecosystem Management Project, (excluding media personnel) as of June, 1994. The survey was conducted via a mail survey and the response rate is as follows:

Survey Attempts	Surveys Completed	Response Rate
2094	797	38%

A response rate of 38% from a single wave is above average and can be attributed to both the nature of the issues involved and the nature of the respondents. We strongly caution the overgeneralization of the survey results to non-respondents, however. Representatives of some constituencies regarding certain issues may have been less likely to respond than others, decreasing the level of certainty regarding the generalization of the results.

What can be said of the background characteristics of the respondents? The following demographics/background questions outline the nature of the survey respondents. The results in Table 1 report the gender, age, education, ethnicity, economic livelihood and organizational membership if any.

TABLE 1

	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENT
GENDER		
Female	156	19.6%
Male	612	76.8%
Non-responses	29	3.6%
AGE		
25 and younger	13	1.6%
26 through 35	98	12.3%
36 through 45	227	28.5%
46 through 55	232	29.1%
56 and older	212	26.6%
Non-responses	15	1.9%
EDUCATION		
Some grade school	0	0.0%
Completed grade school	1	0.1%
Some high school	9	1.1%
Completed high school	43	5.4%
Some college	147	18.4%
Completed college	201	25.2%
Some graduate work	135	16.9%
Advanced degree	250	31.4%
Non-responses	11	1.4%
ETHNICITY		
White	726	91.1%
African-American	0	0.0%
Mexican-American	2	0.3%
Native-American	12	1.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	0.6%
Other	30	3.8%
Non-responses	22	2.8%

Do you or any of your immediate family depend upon the timber, ranching, agricultural, hydro-electric, tourism or fishing industry for your economic livelihood?

	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENT
Yes	474	59.5%
No	311	39.0%
Non-responses	12	1.5%

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP

Environmental group member	349	43.8%
Recreation group member	244	30.6%
Wise-use group member	256	32.1%

In addition to these basic demographic questions, two questions were included to evaluate the political orientation and satisfaction with area of residence, respectively, in order to further examine the profile of the respondents. The results are as follows:

On domestic policy issues, would you consider yourself to be:

	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENT
Very liberal	47	5.9%
Liberal	156	19.6%
Moderate	297	37.3%
Conservative	209	26.2%
Very conservative	66	8.3%
Non-responses	22	2.8%

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?: "I would rather live in my community than any other community." The results show overwhelmingly that the respondents are very fond of the area in which they live, and may partially explain their tendency to be more involved in land-use issues than the general public.

	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENT
Strongly disagree	25	3.1%
Disagree	90	11.3%
Uncertain	113	14.2%
Agree	239	30.0%
Strongly agree	315	39.5%
Non-responses	15	1.9%

SECTION II: General Survey Results

A. Section 1

Overview

One significant pattern which emerges from the very first question and remains consistent throughout the survey is the wide distribution of responses across the selected options. Moreover, a significantly large level of respondents selected choices on each side of the questions, with fewer respondents selecting choices towards the middle. This may be attributed to the fact that the population surveyed is composed of activists in the participant process and by virtue of their participation will be less likely to express a "neutral" position.

There also appears to be more support for protecting the environment in general. Particularly, when respondents were asked whether they have an ethical obligation to protect plant and animal species, an overwhelmingly large number showed strong support for this view. This asymmetrical distribution may be attributed to a larger number of respondents from environmental groups within the survey population.

Results

Q-1 a. Plants and animals exist primarily for human use.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	299	37.5%
Disagree	104	13.0%
Neutral	105	13.2%
Agree	125	15.7%
Strongly agree	149	18.7%
Non-responses	15	1.9%

b. Humankind was created to rule over the rest of nature.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	346	43.4%
Disagree	70	8.8%
Neutral	99	12.4%
Agree	105	15.7%
Strongly agree	158	19.8%
Non-responses	19	2.4%

c. Humans have an ethical obligation to protect plant and animal species.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	28	3.5%
Disagree	56	7.0%
Neutral	95	11.9%
Agree	222	27.9%
Strongly agree	380	47.7%
Non-responses	16	2.0%

d. The earth should have fewer people on it.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	82	10.3%
Disagree	72	9.0%
Neutral	154	19.3%
Agree	146	18.3%
Strongly agree	321	40.3%
Non-responses	22	2.8%

e. Wildlife, plants, and humans have equal rights to live and develop on the earth.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	178	22.3%
Disagree	115	14.4%
Neutral	104	13.0%
Agree	133	16.7%
Strongly agree	243	30.5%
Non-responses	24	3.0%

Q-2 Recently there has been a lot of talk about whether public lands in the Western United States are deteriorating due to current management practices. Some people feel there are no environmental problems now while others feel that there are problems already. Which view best describes your opinion in this area?

	Number of responses		Percent
No environmental problem exists now in the Western U.S.	1	31	3.9%
Uncertain	2	102	12.8%
Serious environmental problems already exist in the Western U.S.	3	87	10.9%
Non-responses	4	15	1.9%
	5	104	13.0%
	6	140	17.6%
	7	297	37.3%
		21	2.6%

B. Section 2

Overview

This section deals with questions concerning the general nature of federal forests and federal rangelands which have been designated for multiple purposes. Another significant finding lies in the participants' commitment to protect habitat and wildlife. Significant support for salmon, wildlife and plant communities is demonstrated in question 3. However, there is considerable disagreement on ways to go about protecting wildlife and habitat. Particularly, questions regarding Endangered Species laws and wilderness areas exhibit elements of discontent with present policies. Similarly, those questions which weigh socioeconomic versus ecological issues come up short on support for timber jobs and grazing rights. Overgeneralization of these results is again strongly cautioned as this may be attributed to a higher number of participants associating with environmental organizations in the survey.

- Q-3 a. The economic livelihood of local communities should be given the highest priority when making decisions concerning public lands.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	186	23.3%
Disagree	154	19.3%
Neutral	60	7.5%
Agree	182	22.8%
Strongly agree	207	26.0%
Non-responses	8	1.0%

b. Greater protection should be given to fish such as salmon on public lands.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	103	12.9%
Disagree	154	19.3%
Neutral	105	13.2%
Agree	145	18.2%
Strongly agree	283	35.5%
Non-responses	7	0.9%

c. Endangered species laws should be altered to maintain timber and ranching jobs on public lands.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	288	36.1%
Disagree	84	10.5%
Neutral	37	4.6%
Agree	138	17.3%
Strongly agree	241	30.2%
Non-responses	9	1.1%

d. Greater protection should be given to wildlife habitat on public lands.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	107	13.4%
Disagree	154	19.3%
Neutral	99	12.4%
Agree	143	17.9%
Strongly agree	286	35.9%
Non-responses	8	1.0%

e. More wilderness areas should be established on public lands.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	339	42.5%
Disagree	68	8.5%
Neutral	81	10.2%
Agree	92	11.5%
Strongly agree	209	26.2%
Neutral	8	1.0%

f. Greater efforts should be made to protect rare plant communities on public lands.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	147	18.4%
Disagree	151	18.9%
Neutral	106	13.3%
Agree	141	17.7%
Strongly agree	243	30.5%
Non-responses	9	1.1%

g. Survival of timber workers and their families is more important than preservation of old growth forests.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	309	38.8%
Disagree	162	20.3%
Neutral	93	11.7%
Agree	132	16.6%
Strongly agree	84	10.5%
Non-responses	17	2.1%

h. Insect outbreaks on public lands should be allowed to run their natural course.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	309	38.8%
Disagree	162	20.3%
Neutral	93	11.7%
Agree	132	16.6%
Strongly agree	84	10.5%
Non-responses	17	2.1%

i. Federal rangeland management should emphasize livestock grazing over other uses.

	Number of responses	Percent
Strongly disagree	324	40.7%
Disagree	137	17.2%
Neutral	115	14.4%
Agree	131	16.4%
Strongly agree	79	9.9%
Non-responses	11	1.4%

C. Section 3

Overview

This section covers issues directly related to lands within the Columbia River Basin, including forest lands, rivers and reservoirs. From Section 1, we know that these participants are highly educated, moreso than the general public (25.2% completed college and 31.4% have obtained an advanced degree), thus it is not surprising that these individuals also consider themselves very informed about resource issues within the CRB. These respondents also spend a significant amount of time participating in recreation within the Columbia River Basin; more than half of the respondents indicated between somewhat frequently and very frequently. At the same time, a significantly large percentage of respondents indicated they felt there are serious environmental problems within the CRB (32.1%), which is also the highest percentage.

In the area of timber, respondents highly favored selective logging practices, while they were less decisive over clearcutting practices, and favored the use prescribed fires to protect forest health but maintaining harvestable timber. Respondents also overwhelmingly favored road closures in recreation areas.

As pertains to salmon issues, the largest perceived threats to salmon in the Pacific Northwest appear to be dams. Nearly 69% of respondents indicated that they felt that dams are a "Definite threat" to salmon in the Columbia River Basin. And another 18% considered them to be a "Probable threat." Following dams, foreign trawlers and drift nets were perceived as threats by more than 63% of respondents, followed by 44% perceiving habitat destruction as a major threat.

In questions of trust and influence in federal lands management, there is considerable concern that many federal agencies are not living up to many of the public's expectations. Nearly 70 percent indicated they had little or no trust at all in the BLM, and only slightly fewer (56 percent) indicated little or no trust in the U.S. Forest Service. There is also a definite lack of trust in Congress and national public opinion. Highest levels of trust for respondents rest in rural communities in the Columbia River Basin (24.2 and 24.3% responded with either moderate or a great deal of trust, respectively). Surprisingly, western public opinion rated higher levels of trust than did urban communities within the CRB.

Perceptions of the public's role in land management decisions is very high. More than 30 percent indicated they felt that the public should be a full and equal partner in land management decisions.

Q-4 How well informed would you say you are concerning natural resource issues in the Columbia River Basin?

	Number of responses		Percent
Not Informed	1	4	0.5%
	2	22	2.8%
Moderately Informed	3	145	18.2%
	4	296	37.1%
Very Informed	5	322	40.4%
Non-responses		8	1.0%

Q-5 Recently there has been much discussion about whether public lands in the Columbia River Basin (CRB) are deteriorating due to current management practices. Some people feel there are no environmental problems now while others feel that there are problems already. Which view best describes your opinion in this area?

	Number of responses		Percent
No environmental problem exists now in the CRB.	1	25	3.1%
Uncertain	2	105	13.2%
Serious environmental problems already exist in the CRB.	3	86	10.8%
	4	24	3.0%
	5	123	15.4%
	6	164	20.6%
	7	256	32.1%
Non-responses		14	1.8%

Q-6 a. How often, if ever, have you visited public lands in the Columbia River Basin for recreation?

	Number of responses		Percent
Never		16	2.0%
Rarely		98	12.3%
Occasionally		232	29.1%
Somewhat frequently		244	30.6%
Very frequently		187	23.5%
Non-responses		20	2.5%

b. Thinking back to your last recreation trip in the Columbia River Basin, how important were the following reasons for going on the trip?

	Number of responses		Percent
<u>Being with others</u>			
Not Important	1	287	36.0%
Moderately Important	2	124	15.6%
Very important	3	164	20.6%
	4	86	10.8%
	5	78	9.8%
Non-responses		58	7.3%

	Number of responses		Percent
<u>Learning about nature</u>			
Not	1	80	10.0%
Important	2	97	12.2%
Moderately	3	182	22.8%
Important	4	198	24.3%
Very important	5	191	24.0%
Non-responses		49	6.1%
<u>Viewing scenery</u>			
Not	1	23	2.9%
Important	2	22	2.8%
Moderately	3	138	17.3%
Important	4	258	32.4%
Very important	5	314	39.4%
Non-responses		42	5.3%
<u>Physical fitness</u>			
Not	1	113	14.2%
Important	2	113	14.2%
Moderately	3	238	29.9%
Important	4	177	22.2%
Very important	5	101	12.7%
Non-responses		55	6.9%
<u>Excitement and adventure</u>			
Not	1	83	10.4%
Important	2	105	13.2%
Moderately	3	194	24.3%
Important	4	223	28.0%
Very important	5	141	17.7%
Non-responses		51	6.4%
<u>Escape from normal routine</u>			
Not	1	37	4.6%
Important	2	20	2.5%
Moderately	3	102	12.8%
Important	4	239	30.0%
Very important	5	359	45.0%
Non-responses		40	5.0%

<u>Getting away from other people</u>	Number of responses		Percent
Not	1	61	7.7%
Important	2	72	9.0%
Moderately Important	3	141	17.7%
Very important	4	234	29.4%
Non-responses	5	247	31.0%
		42	5.3%

c. When you visited public lands in the Columbia River Basin, did other uses interfere (crowding, noise, grazing, logging, etc.) with your activities?

	Number of responses		Percent
Yes		315	39.5%
No		422	52.9%
Don't remember		25	3.1%
Non-responses		35	4.4%

Q-7 Which THREE of the following factors are most important to you and your family concerning the future of public lands in the Columbia River Basin?

	Number of responses		Percent
1. <u>Quality place to live</u>			
Circled		339	42.5%
Not circled		450	56.5%
Non-responses		8	1.0%
2. <u>Outdoor recreation</u>			
Circled		131	16.4%
Not circled		658	82.6%
Non-responses		8	1.0%
3. <u>Vacation destination</u>			
Circled		17	2.1%
Not circled		772	96.9%
Non-responses		8	1.0%

		Number of responses	Percent
4.	<u>Wilderness</u>		
	Circled	119	14.9%
	Not circled	670	84.1%
	Non-responses	8	1.0%
5.	<u>Wild and scenic rivers</u>		
	Circled	49	6.1%
	Not circled	740	92.8%
	Non-responses	8	1.0%
6.	<u>Wildlife habitat</u>		
	Circled	176	22.1%
	Not circled	613	76.9%
	Non-responses	8	1.0%
7.	<u>Salmon</u>		
	Circled	65	8.2%
	Not circled	724	90.8%
	Non-responses	8	1.0%
8.	<u>Ecological health</u>		
	Circled	353	44.3%
	Not circled	436	54.7%
	Non-responses	8	1.0%
9.	<u>Solitude/spiritual values</u>		
	Circled	85	10.7%
	Not circled	704	88.3%
	Non-responses	8	1.0%
10.	<u>Resources for future generations</u>		
	Circled	382	47.9%
	Not circled	406	50.9%
	Non-responses	9	1.1%
11.	<u>Timber production</u>		
	Circled	196	24.6%
	Not circled	592	74.3%
	Non-responses	9	9.9%

		Number of responses	Percent
12.	<u>Livestock grazing</u>		
	Circled	95	11.9%
	Not circled	693	87.0%
	Non-responses	9	1.1%
13.	<u>Commercial fishing</u>		
	Circled	4	0.5%
	Not circled	784	98.4%
	Non-responses	9	1.1%
14.	<u>Agriculture</u>		
	Circled	116	14.6%
	Not circled	672	84.3%
	Non-responses	9	1.1%
15.	<u>Reservoir storage</u>		
	Circled	26	3.3%
	Not circled	762	95.6%
	Non-responses	9	1.1%
16.	<u>Hydro-electric power</u>		
	Circled	79	9.9%
	Not-circled	709	89.0%
	Non-responses	9	1.1%
17.	<u>Economic opportunity</u>		
	Circled	131	16.4%
	Not-circled	657	82.4%
	Non-responses	9	1.1%
18.	<u>Other</u>		
	Circled	40	5.0%
	Not-circled	748	93.9%
	Non-responses	9	1.1%

Q-8 Some people favor the introduction of fire in all federal forest lands to control disease, insects, and excessive fuel levels. Others suggest this use of fire is unnecessary and dangerous. Which of the following statements (if any) comes closest to your views?

1. We should suppress fire in all federal forests.

Number of responses	Percent
6	0.8%

2.	We should suppress fire in all federal forests managed for timber, and use pesticides or salvage logging if forest health is endangered.	Number of responses	Percent
		120	15.1%
3.	We should suppress wildfires in federal forests managed for timber; however, controlled fire may be used to protect forest health.	Number of responses	Percent
		292	36.6%
4.	We should suppress wildfires on federal forests only if they threaten human lives or property; otherwise we should allow fire to resume its natural role in forests.	Number of responses	Percent
		106	13.3%
5.	Other.	Number of responses	Percent
		62	7.8%

Q-9 Listed below are various management alternatives that have been suggested as possible strategies for improving the conditions on public lands in the Columbia River Basin. For each one, indicate your level of support or opposition.

		Number of responses	Percent
a.	<u>Selective logging practices</u>		
	Strongly oppose	23	2.9%
	Oppose	37	4.6%
	Neutral	68	8.5%
	Support	193	24.2%
	Strongly support	457	57.3%
	Non-responses	19	2.4%
b.	<u>Clearcutting in burn or insect infested areas</u>		
	Strongly oppose	222	27.9%
	Oppose	118	14.8%
	Neutral	89	11.2%
	Support	128	16.1%
	Strongly support	217	27.2%
	Non-responses	23	2.9%

	Number of responses	Percent
c. <u>Selective cutting in burn or insect infested areas</u>		
Strongly oppose	49	6.1%
Oppose	69	8.7%
Neutral	121	15.2%
Support	237	29.7%
Strongly support	285	35.8%
Non-responses	36	4.5%
d. <u>Increased regulation to protect fish and wildlife habitat</u>		
Strongly oppose	213	26.7%
Oppose	118	14.8%
Neutral	80	10.0%
Support	102	12.8%
Strongly support	269	33.8%
Non-responses	15	1.9%
e. <u>Road closures in ecologically sensitive areas where recreation occurs</u>		
Strongly oppose	101	12.7%
Oppose	100	12.5%
Neutral	86	10.8%
Support	150	18.8%
Strongly support	346	43.4%
Non-responses	14	1.8%
f. <u>Increased regulation of livestock grazing</u>		
Strongly oppose	161	20.2%
Oppose	117	14.7%
Neutral	75	9.4%
Support	115	14.4%
Strongly support	310	38.9%
Non-responses	19	2.4%

		Number of responses	Percent
g.	<u>Use of chemical insecticides and herbicides</u>		
	Strongly oppose	232	29.1%
	Oppose	119	14.9%
	Neutral	132	16.6%
	Support	161	20.2%
	Strongly support	138	17.3%
	Non-responses	15	1.9%
h.	<u>Use of organic insecticides and herbicides</u>		
	Strongly oppose	41	5.1%
	Oppose	88	11.0%
	Neutral	186	23.3%
	Support	235	29.5%
	Strongly support	226	28.4%
	Non-responses	21	2.6%
i.	<u>Selective harvesting to prevent forest disease and infestations</u>		
	Strongly oppose	46	5.8%
	Oppose	64	8.0%
	Neutral	67	8.4%
	Support	188	23.6%
	Strongly support	412	51.7%
	Non-responses	20	2.5%

Q-10 How well informed would you say you are concerning the status of salmon runs in the Pacific Northwest?

	Number of responses		Percent
Not informed	1	12	1.5%
	2	30	3.8%
Moderately informed	3	172	21.6%
	4	285	35.8%
Very informed	5	283	35.5%
		15	1.9%
Non-responses			

Q-11 Listed below are a number of factors that have been argued to be related to declining salmon runs in the Columbia River and its tributaries east of the Cascade Mountains. For each factor, please indicate whether you view it as a definite threat, a probable threat, or not a threat to Pacific Salmon runs.

	Number of responses	Percent
a. <u>Foreign trawlers and drift nets</u>		
Definite threat to salmon	505	63.4%
Probable threat to salmon	222	27.9%
Not a threat to salmon	21	2.6%
Don't know	24	3.0%
Non-responses	25	3.1%
b. <u>Ocean warming (El Nino)</u>		
Definite threat to salmon	220	27.6%
Probable threat to salmon	287	36.0%
Not a threat to salmon	112	14.1%
Don't know	143	17.9%
Non-responses	35	4.4%
c. <u>Predators such as seals</u>		
Definite threat to salmon	276	34.6%
Probable threat to salmon	236	29.6%
Not a threat to salmon	217	27.2%
Don't know	27	3.4%
Non-responses	41	5.1%
d. <u>Habitat destruction on public and private forest lands</u>		
Definite threat to salmon	355	44.5%
Probable threat to salmon	168	21.1%
Not a threat to salmon	207	26.0%
Don't know	29	3.6%
Non-responses	38	4.8%
e. <u>Habitat destruction on public and private rangelands</u>		
Definite threat to salmon	335	42.0%
Probable threat to salmon	177	22.2%
Not a threat to salmon	224	28.1%
Don't know	28	3.5%
Non-responses	33	4.1%
f. <u>Dams</u>		
Definite threat to salmon	549	68.9%
Probable threat to salmon	150	18.8%
Not a threat to salmon	55	6.9%
Don't know	15	1.9%
Non-responses	28	3.5%

		Number of responses	Percent
g.	<u>Irrigation</u>		
	Definite threat to salmon	285	35.8%
	Probable threat to salmon	244	30.6%
	Not a threat to salmon	199	25.0%
	Don't know	32	4.0%
	Non-responses		
h.	<u>Water pollution</u>		
	Definite threat to salmon	354	44.4%
	Probable threat to salmon	288	36.1%
	Not a threat to salmon	82	10.3%
	Don't know	28	3.5%
	Non-responses	45	5.6%
i.	<u>Native American gill nets</u>		
	Definite threat to salmon	264	33.1%
	Probable threat to salmon	287	36.0%
	Not a threat to salmon	157	19.7%
	Don't know	49	6.1%
	Non-responses	40	5.0%
j.	<u>Domestic commercial fishing industry</u>		
	Definite threat to salmon	264	33.1%
	Probable threat to salmon	287	36.0%
	Not a threat to salmon	157	19.7%
	Don't know	49	6.1%
	Non-responses	40	5.0%
k.	<u>Recreation and sports fishing</u>		
	Definite threat to salmon	84	10.5%
	Probable threat to salmon	280	35.1%
	Not a threat to salmon	366	45.9%
	Don't know	40	5.0%
	Non-responses	27	3.4%
l.	<u>Other</u>		
	Definite threat to salmon	125	15.7%
	Probable threat to salmon	24	3.0%
	Not a threat to salmon	12	1.5%
	Don't know	14	1.8%
	Non-responses	622	78.0%

Q-12 Recovery of Pacific salmon may require difficult trade-offs between restoring natural environmental conditions (spawning habitat, increased river flows) and socioeconomic considerations (employment, recreation, irrigation, hydro-electric power). Where would you locate yourself on the following scale concerning this issue?

	Number of responses		Percent
The highest priority should be given to recovery of salmon, even if there are negative socioeconomic consequences.	1	163	20.5%
	2	129	16.2%
	3	66	8.3%
Salmon recovery and socioeconomic factors should be given equal priority.	4	134	16.8%
	5	120	15.1%
The highest priority should be given to socioeconomic considerations, even if there are negative consequences for salmon.	6	81	10.2%
	7	74	9.3%
Non-responses		30	3.8%

Q-13 In recent years, many organizations and institutions have influenced federal public lands policy. We would like to know how much trust you have in those below that are directly or indirectly involved in managing federal forests and rangelands in the Columbia River Basin. On the left side of the page, circle the number that indicates your trust in their ability to contribute to good public lands management. On the right side, circle the number that indicates the amount of influence these organizations should have in public lands management.

<u>How Much Trust do You Have in the Following:</u>	Number of responses	Percent
1. <u>U.S. Bureau of Land Management</u>		
No trust at all	145	18.2%
Limited trust	329	41.3%
Uncertain	91	11.4%
Moderate trust	182	22.8%
Great deal of trust	30	3.8%
Non-responses	20	2.5%

	Number of responses	Percent
2. <u>U.S.D.A. Forest Service</u>		
No trust at all	133	16.7%
Limited trust	319	40.0%
Uncertain	82	10.3%
Moderate trust	199	25.0%
Great deal of trust	41	5.1%
Non-responses	23	2.9%
3. <u>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</u>		
No trust at all	210	26.3%
Limited trust	227	28.5%
Uncertain	119	14.9%
Moderate trust	185	23.2%
Great deal of trust	34	4.3%
Non-responses	22	2.8%
4. <u>U.S. Congress</u>		
No trust at all	339	42.5%
Limited trust	301	37.8%
Uncertain	85	10.7%
Moderate trust	40	5.0%
Great deal of trust	7	0.9%
Non-responses	25	3.1%
5. <u>Native American Governments</u>		
No trust at all	149	18.7%
Limited trust	211	26.5%
Uncertain	200	25.1%
Moderate trust	169	21.2%
Great deal of trust	40	5.0%
Non-responses	28	3.5%
6. <u>Army Corps of Engineers</u>		
No trust at all	302	37.9%
Limited trust	262	32.9%
Uncertain	122	15.3%
Moderate trust	74	9.3%
Great deal of trust	13	1.6%
Non-responses	24	3.0%

	Number of responses	Percent
7.	<u>Bonneville Power Administration</u>	
	No trust at all	261 32.7%
	Limited trust	277 34.8%
	Uncertain	137 17.2%
	Moderate trust	77 9.7%
	Great deal of trust	18 2.3%
	Non-responses	27 3.4%
8.	<u>University Research Scientists</u>	
	No trust at all	68 8.5%
	Limited trust	139 17.4%
	Uncertain	150 18.8%
	Moderate trust	298 37.4%
	Great deal of trust	112 14.1%
	Non-responses	30 3.8%
9.	<u>Federal Courts</u>	
	No trust at all	248 31.1%
	Limited trust	164 20.6%
	Uncertain	127 15.9%
	Moderate trust	190 23.8%
	Great deal of trust	42 5.3%
	Non-responses	26 3.3%
10.	<u>National Public Opinion</u>	
	No trust at all	256 32.1%
	Limited trust	221 27.7%
	Uncertain	155 19.4%
	Moderate trust	110 13.8%
	Great deal of trust	29 3.6%
	Non-responses	26 3.3%
11.	<u>Western U.S. Public Opinion</u>	
	No trust at all	104 13.0%
	Limited trust	234 29.4%
	Uncertain	171 21.5%
	Moderate trust	198 24.8%
	Great deal of trust	65 8.2%
	Non-responses	25 3.1%

	Number of responses	Percent
12. <u>Urban communities in the Columbia River Basin</u>		
No trust at all	139	17.4%
Limited trust	248	31.1%
Uncertain	183	23.0%
Moderate trust	156	19.6%
Great deal of trust	43	5.4%
Non-responses	28	3.5%
13. <u>Rural communities in the Columbia River Basin</u>		
No trust at all	97	12.2%
Limited trust	167	21.0%
Uncertain	121	15.2%
Moderate trust	193	24.2%
Great deal of trust	194	24.3%
Non-responses	25	3.1%
<u>How Much Influence Should Each of the Following Have:</u>		
1. <u>U.S. Bureau of Land Management</u>		
None at all	48	6.0%
Limited influence	240	30.1%
Uncertain	89	11.2%
Moderate influence	255	32.0%
A great deal	121	15.2%
Non-responses	44	5.5%
2. <u>U.S.D.A. Forest Service</u>		
None at all	38	4.8%
Limited influence	217	27.2%
Uncertain	78	9.8%
Moderate influence	273	34.3%
A great deal	147	18.4%
Non-responses	44	5.5%
3. <u>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</u>		
None at all	90	11.3%
Limited influence	200	25.1%
Uncertain	92	11.5%
Moderate influence	240	30.1%
A great deal	133	16.7%
Non-responses	42	5.3%

	Number of responses	Percent
4. <u>U.S. Congress</u>		
None at all	152	19.1%
Limited influence	269	33.8%
Uncertain	111	13.9%
Moderate influence	153	19.2%
A great deal	60	7.5%
Non-responses	52	6.5%
5. <u>Native American Governments</u>		
None at all	110	13.8%
Limited influence	222	27.9%
Uncertain	140	17.6%
Moderate influence	194	24.3%
A great deal	84	10.5%
Non-responses	47	5.9%
6. <u>Army Corps of Engineers</u>		
None at all	238	29.9%
Limited influence	288	36.1%
Uncertain	110	13.8%
Moderate influence	96	12.0%
A great deal	20	2.5%
Non-responses	45	5.6%
7. <u>Bonneville Power Administration</u>		
None at all	203	25.5%
Limited influence	316	39.6%
Uncertain	112	14.1%
Moderate influence	95	11.9%
A great deal	25	3.1%
Non-responses	46	5.8%
8. <u>University Research Scientists</u>		
None at all	63	7.9%
Limited influence	153	19.2%
Uncertain	137	17.2%
Moderate influence	252	31.6%
A great deal	141	17.7%
Non-responses	51	6.4%

		Number of responses	Percent
9.	<u>Federal Courts</u>		
	None at all	210	26.3%
	Limited influence	188	23.6%
	Uncertain	110	13.8%
	Moderate influence	163	20.5%
	A great deal	76	9.5%
	Non-responses	50	6.3%
10.	<u>National Public Opinion</u>		
	None at all	185	23.2%
	Limited influence	229	28.7%
	Uncertain	122	15.3%
	Moderate influence	152	19.1%
	A great deal	60	7.5%
	Non-responses	49	6.1%
11.	<u>Western U.S. Public Opinion</u>		
	None at all	56	7.0%
	Limited influence	192	24.1%
	Uncertain	149	18.7%
	Moderate influence	252	31.6%
	A great deal	102	12.8%
	Non-responses	46	5.8%
12.	<u>Urban communities in the Columbia River Basin</u>		
	None at all	72	9.0%
	Limited influence	233	29.2%
	Uncertain	149	18.7%
	Moderate influence	218	27.4%
	A great deal	79	9.9%
	Non-responses	46	5.8%
13.	<u>Rural communities in the Columbia River Basin</u>		
	None at all	41	5.1%
	Limited influence	144	18.1%
	Uncertain	104	13.0%
	Moderate influence	223	28.0%
	A great deal	241	30.2%
	Non-responses	44	5.5%

Q-14 In your opinion, what would be a realistic role for the public in federal lands management concerning the Columbia River Basin?

1.	None, let resource professionals (USFS, BLM) decide.		
	Number of responses	Percent	
	8	1.0%	
2.	Provide suggestions and let resource professionals decide.		
	Number of responses	Percent	
	128	16.1%	
3.	Serve on advisory boards that review and comment on decisions.		
	Number of responses	Percent	
	228	28.6%	
4.	Act as full and equal partner in making management decisions.		
	Number of responses	Percent	
	244	30.6%	
5.	The public should decide management issues and resource professionals should carry them out.		
	Number of responses	Percent	
	73	9.2%	
6.	Other.		
	Number of responses	Percent	
	76	9.5%	
7.	Non-responses.		
	Number of responses	Percent	
	40	5.0%	

SECTION III: SUPPLEMENTAL SURVEY RESULTS

The Supplemental Survey was sent in addition to the main survey to participants of the Eastside Ecosystem Management project. This section of the survey dealt with more specific management issues, such as the use of fire and girdling of trees. Respondents indicated support for "tools" such as mimicking natural disturbances, non-commercial firewood gathering and using prescribed fire to protect overall forest health. In addition, most opposed such methods as girdling, and measures which advocate letting nature do what it will. The strongest response came from the response which asked respondents to rate doing nothing at all, where 53 percent strongly opposed such an option.

A second question which asked a broader question of land management options, received a broad range of responses. However, the "other" option which allows respondents to indicate their own personal response, showed approximately 27 percent of respondents indicating something other than the alternatives given. Again, we caution the overgeneralization of non-respondents, as non-responses may be due to strongly held views concerning the management issues or the context of the question.

The final question surveys respondents trust in motive and ability of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service. Similar to question 13, respondents expressed little to no trust in agency motive, and only slightly better in agency ability.

Q-23 As part of the jointly conducted area analysis, a set of land management "tools" were identified that people agreed could accomplish broad scale ecological objectives--although each tool would require a different amount of time, and thus, would service personal objectives differently. First, rate the amount of opposition or support you personally would give each "tool" by circling the appropriate number.

	Number of responses	Percent
1. <u>Harvest trees in ways that mimic natural disturbances.</u>		
Strongly oppose	70	8.8%
Oppose	71	8.9%
Neutral	119	14.9%
Support	202	25.3%
Strongly support	258	32.4%
Non-responses	77	9.7%
2. <u>Use prescribed fire to reduce forest diseases, insects, and excessive fuel levels.</u>		
Strongly oppose	51	6.4%
Oppose	71	8.9%
Neutral	77	9.7%
Support	244	30.6%
Strongly support	290	36.4%
Non-responses	64	8.0%
3. <u>Allow non-commercial firewood gathering.</u>		
Strongly oppose	14	1.8%
Oppose	48	6.0%
Neutral	138	17.3%
Support	215	27.0%
Strongly support	318	39.9%
Non-responses	64	8.0%

	Number of responses	Percent
4. <u>Girdle trees and leave them in place.</u>		
Strongly oppose	293	36.8%
Oppose	116	14.6%
Neutral	182	22.8%
Support	80	10.0%
Strongly support	37	4.6%
Non-responses	89	11.2%
5. <u>Let wildfires burn without attempting to control them unless they threaten adjoining land management values.</u>		
Strongly oppose	260	32.6%
Oppose	126	15.8%
Neutral	79	9.9%
Support	152	19.1%
Strongly support	112	14.1%
Non-responses	68	8.5%
6. <u>Let insect outbreaks run their natural course unless they begin to threaten adjoining land management values.</u>		
Strongly oppose	313	39.3%
Oppose	132	16.6%
Neutral	62	7.8%
Support	141	17.7%
Strongly support	83	10.4%
Non-responses	66	8.3%
7. <u>Do nothing, wait for time and natural processes to accomplish ecological outcomes (this includes wildfire, insects, diseases, etc.).</u>		
Strongly oppose	427	53.6%
Oppose	107	13.4%
Neutral	51	6.4%
Support	85	10.7%
Strongly support	62	7.8%
Non-responses	65	8.2%

Rank each one as to your personal preference for each management practice (Begin by placing a "1" to the side of the practice you most prefer, a "2" next to your second preference, etc. until all items have been numbered).

	Number of responses	Percent
1. <u>Harvest trees in ways that mimic natural disturbances.</u>		
One	264	33.1%
Two	94	11.8%
Three	59	7.4%
Four	49	6.1%
Five	33	4.1%
Six	25	3.1%
Seven	41	5.1%
Non-responses	232	29.1%
2. <u>Use prescribed fire to reduce forest diseases, insects, and excessive fuel levels.</u>		
One	148	18.6%
Two	193	24.2%
Three	115	14.4%
Four	51	6.4%
Five	39	4.9%
Six	21	2.6%
Seven	6	0.8%
Non-responses	224	28.1%
3. <u>Allow non-commercial firewood gathering.</u>		
One	58	7.3%
Two	118	14.8%
Three	149	18.7%
Four	82	10.3%
Five	61	7.7%
Six	66	8.3%
Seven	29	3.6%
Non-responses	234	29.4%

	Number of responses	Percent
4. <u>Girdle trees and leave them in place.</u>		
One	9	1.1%
Two	13	1.6%
Three	54	6.8%
Four	131	16.4%
Five	99	12.4%
Six	102	12.8%
Seven	115	14.4%
Non-responses	274	34.4%
5. <u>Let wildfires burn without attempting to control them unless they threaten adjoining land management values.</u>		
One	43	5.4%
Two	88	11.0%
Three	80	10.0%
Four	109	13.7%
Five	141	17.7%
Six	58	7.3%
Seven	37	4.6%
Non-responses	241	30.2%
6. <u>Let insect outbreaks run their natural course unless they begin to threaten adjoining land management values.</u>		
One	15	1.9%
Two	69	8.7%
Three	74	9.3%
Four	78	9.8%
Five	124	15.6%
Six	155	19.4%
Seven	37	4.6%
Non-responses	245	30.7%

	Number of responses	Percent
7. <u>Do nothing, wait for time and natural processes to accomplish ecological outcomes (this includes wildfire, insects, diseases, etc.).</u>		
One	74	9.3%
Two	20	2.5%
Three	30	3.8%
Four	40	5.0%
Five	49	6.1%
Six	69	8.7%
Seven	264	33.1%
Non-responses	251	31.5%

Q-24 Assume that a public consensus has been reached for a set of ecological objectives in a watershed of 20 to 40 thousand acres in the Columbia River Basin. A variety of management tools have been determined appropriate for reaching the objectives including prescribed fire, harvesting, putting roads to bed, seeding, etc. Circle which one of the following approaches you would prefer.

1. Conduct the full range of management activities over relatively large blocks of the watershed during concentrated periods. This approach would result in more intensive management for short periods, with longer periods of rest between entries.

Number of responses	Percent
182	22.8%

2. Disperse selected management activities throughout the watershed on a rotating basis. This approach would result in less intensive management over longer periods, with shorter periods of rest between entries.

Number of responses	Percent
281	35.3%

3. Other.

Number of responses	Percent
217	27.2%

4. Non-responses

Number of responses	Percent
117	14.7%

Q-25 If it was decided that prescribed burning for short periods of time was necessary to accomplish certain ecological objectives, how willing are you to put up with decreased air quality?

	Number of responses	Percent
a. <u>At your home</u>		
Very willing	331	41.5%
Somewhat willing	263	33.0%
Not very willing	79	9.9%
Not willing at all	48	6.0%
Non-responses	76	9.5%
b. <u>Where you go for recreation</u>		
Very willing	378	47.4%
Somewhat willing	231	29.0%
Not very willing	69	8.7%
Not willing at all	43	5.4%
Non-responses	76	9.5%

Q-26 Several federal agencies are involved in the Eastside Ecosystem Management Project which seeks to develop a "scientifically sound, ecosystem-based strategy" for public lands in the Columbia River Basin. We would like to know how much trust you have in the **ABILITY** and **MOTIVES** of two of these agencies to carry out this task. On the left side of the page, circle the number that indicates your trust in their ability to contribute to good public lands management. On the right side, circle the number that indicates the amount of trust you have in these agencies' motives to carry out their mission.

How Much Trust do You
Have in Agency Ability:

U.S.D.I. Bureau of Land
Management

No trust at all	107	13.4%
Limited trust	257	32.2%
Uncertain	91	11.4%
Moderate trust	201	25.2%
Great deal of trust	53	6.6%
Non-responses	88	11.0%

<u>U.S.D.A. Forest Service</u>	Number of responses	Percent
No trust at all	90	11.3%
Limited trust	244	30.6%
Uncertain	62	7.8%
Moderate trust	239	30.0%
Great deal of trust	76	9.5%
Non-responses	86	10.8%

**How Much Trust do You
Have in Agency Motive:**

<u>U.S.D.I. Bureau of Land Management</u>	Number of responses	Percent
No trust at all	164	20.6%
Limited trust	267	33.5%
Uncertain	88	11.0%
Moderate trust	151	18.9%
Great deal of trust	34	4.3%
Non-responses	93	11.7%

<u>U.S.D.A. Forest Service</u>	Number of responses	Percent
No trust at all	155	19.4%
Limited trust	256	32.1%
Uncertain	77	9.7%
Moderate trust	173	21.7%
Great deal of trust	45	5.6%
Non-responses	91	11.4%

SECTION IV: Content Analysis of Comments Regarding the Columbia River Basin Survey

Overview

Many of the returned surveys contained extensive comments regarding a wide range of issues. These comments came in two separate forms. First, comments were offered by respondents filling-in an "other" option on specific questions when they felt the alternatives offered were inadequate. Second, respondents to the survey volunteered comments throughout the margins of the survey, on separate sheets of paper attached to the survey, and some respondents provided extensive comments in lieu of completing the survey. Because these comments were unsolicited, they provide an excellent source of data regarding the opinions of the respondents, furnishing evidence on the reasoning underlying survey responses and allowing for a broader discussion of the topics covered in the study. In the case of the comments being offered where the respondent selected the "other" option, the respondent was given a chance to respond without having to choose between predetermined choices.

Although the fullest understanding of the comments can only come from reading them in their entirety, the comments can be analyzed and organized for much quicker and unincumbered interpretation. The best method for doing so in a systematic fashion is called **content analysis**, which constitutes a common method for qualitative data collection and analysis employed among social scientists. By conducting content analysis of the comments offered by the respondents, we were able to determine the frequency of the specific responses to questions Q-6c, Q-7, Q-8, Q-11, Q-14 and Q-24, and also determine which topics and concerns are the sources of commentary throughout the survey.

Methodology and Results of "Other" Responses

In reviewing the analysis of the questions where the "other" option had been chosen and the respondents offered their own selection, it must be kept in mind that such an analysis cannot account for all underlying concerns or issues. Although the method used for determining the classification of comments provides a convenient reference and reflects a rather rigorous form of analysis, often it can only account for about half of the responses in this study. Again, it must be made clear that to gain the fullest understanding of the content of the comments a full reading of the comments provided must be conducted.

In determining the systematic classification of the aggregateable comments, a series of steps were followed. First, keywords or word-phrases for the comments were determined by prescreening the comments and determining which types of comments occurred most frequently. Keywords or phrases that captured the nature of the comment were then determined to represent the most frequently occurring comments for those particular questions. The keywords or word-phrases had to be present within the text of the comment for that keyword or phrase to be counted, or words within the text had to represent a synonym for the keyword. The keywords and phrases were then tallied for each question to determine which type of comments were the most frequently occurring -- and only those comments that occurred relatively frequently were categorized into a keyword. If the comment did not fit into a keyword or word-phrase category it was coded "other," and those that made a comment in the space of a particular question but were not relevant to that particular question were coded as "cannot code." The respondent was allowed only one response per question, except Q-6c where up to three separate responses were counted.

Because the coding of the comments allows for a degree of subjectivity in determining the sense of words, a test was conducted to determine the **reliability** of the coding of the comments. After the comments were coded by one researcher, a random sample of 84 survey respondents was then drawn and a second researcher coded the comments made by those respondents in that sample. The percentage of comments coded the same way by **both** researchers was 96%, allowing for a high degree of confidence towards the reliability of the coding.

The results of the analysis of the "other" comments are listed on the following pages.

Q-6c When you visited public lands in the Columbia River Basin, did other uses interfere (crowding, noise, grazing, logging, etc.)

	Number of Responses Marked in "Other"	Percent of Responses
Grazing/Cow Pies	106	26.4
Crowding	50	12.5
Logging	72	18.0
Noise	29	7.2
Clear-Cuts	18	4.4
Motorboats	14	3.5
Snowmobiles	9	2.2
Hunting	7	1.7
Roads	7	1.7
Motorbikes	6	1.5
ORVs	5	1.2
ATVs	3	.7
Irrigation	3	.7
<u>Other¹</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>17.9</u>
Total	401	100.0

Total Number of Respondents = 238²

Percent of Total Number of Survey Respondents = 16.0

¹Cases that fall into this category were topics that occurred only once and could not be assigned to a keyword or word-phrase category.

²Respondents were allowed up to three choices.

Q-7 Which THREE of the following factors are most important to you and your family concerning the future of public lands in the Columbia River Basin? (please circle three responses)

	Number of Responses Marked in "Other"	Percent of Responses
Mining/Mineral/Prospecting	6	15.8
All	4	10.5
Biodiversity	2	5.3
Resource Protection	2	5.3
Watershed Protection	2	5.3
<u>Other</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>55.3</u>
Total	38	100.0

Percent of Total Number of Survey Respondents = 4.5

Q-8 Some people favor the introduction of fire in federal forest lands to control disease, insects, and excessive fuel levels. Others suggest the use of fire is unnecessary and dangerous. Which of the following statements (if any) comes closest to your views? (if uncertain leave blank)

	Number of Responses Marked in "Other"	Percent of Responses
Controlled Fire/Burn	47	32.6
Prescribed Burns/ Suppress Wildfires	9	1.1
Some Suppression	9	1.1
No Suppression	7	.8
Suppress All Fire	3	.4
Other	64	44.4
<u>Cannot Code</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>.6</u>
Total	144	100.0

Percent of Total Number of Survey Respondents = 17.8

Q-11 Listed below are a number of factors that have been argued to be related to declining salmon runs in the Columbia River and its tributaries east of the Cascade Mountains. For each factor, please indicate whether you view it as a definite threat, a probable threat, or not a threat to Pacific Salmon runs.

	Number of Responses Marked in "Other"	Percent of Responses
Fish Hatcheries	17	12.6
Draw-Downs	10	7.4
Predatory Fish	6	4.4
Dams ³	5	3.7
Off-Shore/International Fishing	5	3.7
Wetland/Estuary Destruction	4	3.0
Grazing	3	2.2
Farming	2	1.5
More Than One Cause Listed	8	5.9
All Are Threats	3	2.2
Other	70	51.9
<u>Cannot Code</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>.2</u>
Total	135	100.0

Percent of Total Number of Survey Respondents = 17.1

³Although "dams" was included as an option on the survey, it was included in this list because it was written-in by several of the respondents.

Q-14 In your opinion, what would be a realistic role for the public in federal lands management concerning the Columbia River Basin (please circle one)?

	Number of Responses Marked in "Other"	Percent of Responses
Greater Public Involvement	10	11.1
Greater Role of Scientists	9	10.0
Greater Local Control/Voice	8	8.9
Public is Not Capable	5	5.6
Maintain the Status Quo	3	3.3
Agencies Make Policies with Public Input	3	3.3
Public Should Set/Clarify Goals	2	2.2
Other	45	50.0
<u>Cannot Code</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>.6</u>
Total	90	100.0

Percent of Total Number of Survey Respondents = 10.7

Q-24 Assume that a public consensus has been reached for a set of ecological objectives in a watershed of 20 to 40 thousand acres in the Columbia River Basin. A variety of management tools have been determined appropriate for reaching the objectives including prescribed fire, harvesting, putting roads to bed, seeding, etc. Circle which one of the following approaches you would prefer?

	Number of Responses Marked in "Other"	Percent of Responses
Both 1 and 2	20	10.3
Either 1 or 2	10	5.2
Intensive Management	9	4.6
No Management	8	4.1
Mimic Nature	7	3.6
Adaptive Management	6	3.1
Site Specific Approach	4	2.1
Some Managed/Some Not	3	1.5
Neither 1 Nor 2	3	1.5
Selective Managed	2	1.0
Manage-Evaluate	2	1.0
Other	118	60.8
<u>Cannot Code</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.0</u>
Total	194	100.0

Percent of Total Number of Survey Respondents = 23.1

Methodology and Results of Positive and Negative Comments

Survey respondents also produced an abundance of comments regarding their approval or disapproval of various topics, ranging from specific practices conducted in the Columbia River Basin area to criticisms of specific questions in the CRB survey. The comments throughout the survey were recorded much in the same way as were the comments recorded above in the "other" comments. The "sense" of the comments were determined by careful reading of keyword and phrase in order to give a fuller understanding of the principal topics of concern registered in the survey. In addition, the comments tallied in this section were not limited to one specific question as was the case above. Instead, they include comments made throughout the survey and include those made in the question-specific section above, except for those made regarding Q-6c and Q-11l. The comments made regarding those questions were excluded because almost all of the comments made were negative toward what was mentioned (those questions focused on causes behind depleted salmon runs and interferences upon recreation trips).

The respondents were apportioned up to ten topics to be covered throughout coding of the survey, five in a positive light per keyword or phrase and five in a negative light per keyword or phrase. The results are below:

Positive Comments Made Towards:	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Forest Management	55	35.0
Fire Management	21	13.4
Local People	10	6.3
Multiple Use	7	4.5
Specific Question	6	3.8
BLM	6	3.8
Fire Suppression	5	3.2
USFS	4	2.5
Clear-Cutting	3	1.9
Wise Use	3	1.9
Controlled Burns	2	1.3
Environmentalists	2	1.3
Ecological Balance	1	.6
CRB Survey	1	.6
<u>Other</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>15.9</u>
Total	157	100.0

Total Number of Respondents = 126⁴

Percent of Total Number of Survey Respondents = 15.0%

⁴Respondents were allowed up to five responses

Negative Comments Made Towards:	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Specific Question	81	28.5
USFS	25	8.8
CRB Survey	22	7.7
BLM	21	7.4
Fire Suppression	11	3.9
Forest Management	11	3.9
Special Interests	7	2.5
Clear-Cutting	7	2.5
Environmentalists	5	1.8
Insecticides	4	1.4
USFWS	4	1.4
Timber Industry	4	1.4
Doing Nothing/No Management	3	1.1
Wise Use	3	1.1
Other	69	24.3
<u>Cannot Code</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2.5</u>
Total	284	100.0

Total Number of Respondents = 176⁵

Percent of Total Number of Survey Respondents = 21.0%

⁵Respondents were allowed up to five responses

APPENDIX A:
SURVEY COMMENTS

- 8001 Q8:5) Prescribed burning should be allowed if there is a reason based on scientific evidence.
 Q24) Base each management decision on sound scientific study. Some activities may be intense while other activities may not. Nature is not black and white.
 Q26) Private industry runs both of these agencies through the politicians, as a result, the professionals are limited on doing the job properly.
- 8003 Q24) Conduct an appropriate range of management activities over small blocks of the watershed during concentrated periods with longer rest periods.
- 8005 Q8:5) Need better management 1. Thinning 2. Pruning etc.
 Q9d) The two need to be separate. See mapping with WDW on mule deer routes.
 Q24) Not sure.
- 8006 Q24) Small scale but intensive management, infrequently.
- 8008 Q11l) Estuary development "1"
- 8011 Q2) I am not convinced that if allowed to, the environment can do much to heal itself. The present rampage of fear for the environment is unwarranted.
 Q3a) Depending on conditions.
 Q3b) Present practices are radically in favor now.
 Q3c) Unnecessary if land is correctly managed.
 Q3d) Stop prescribed burns that destroy habitat.
 Q3e) None needed.
 Q3f) Leave alone.
 Q3) Livestock grazing can be beneficial to wildlife habitat if used right and not overgrazed.
 Q5) I do not feel present practices are correct but the environment can survive.
 Q6) I have lived in several areas.
 9b) If all infected or burned.
 Q11 j,k) Regulated "3"
 Q11l) DAMS "1"
 Q24) Both above approaches have drawbacks - select only trees that are mature and have an estimated life span left of ten years for harvesting.
 Q25) Prescribed burning has destroyed more commercial trees than harvesting has.
 Q26) Both the BLM and Forest Service are using management techniques I object to. Both are burning up and clear-cutting timber.
- 8014 Q6c) Too much obvious human alteration of the environment.
- 8017 Q1) We can co exist with proper management and use of natural resources.
- 8018 Q14:6) Depends on who is deemed to represent "the public".

- Q24) In general I prefer #1, but really can't say without knowing resources and objectives.
- 8019 Q6c) Fragile meadows impacted by hikers, trash left, cattle destroying river banks.
Q23) Hard to do. These tools would be used differently in different circumstances.
- 8021 Q3g) Bad question - what survival?? They won't die if we don't cut old growth.
Economic survival?
Q6c) Snowmobiles when cross country skiing.
Q8:5) Agree with #4 but also need prescribed fires and fire suppression should be considered in terms of effects on ecosystem health.
Q9i) Bad question - implies that harvesting can do this. It can't always - Fire is indicated for health.
Q11l) Loss of H2O for Columbia River Basin watersheds due to increased development and associated water uses.
Q23c) Only where wood can be taken and maintain enough for wildfire needs. No snag falling.
Q24) Resource removal should only take place when it does not negatively impact ecosystem health, the other activities can happen any time.
- 8022 Q6c) Crowding and littering.
Q11c) 1/2 the fish I catch have teeth marks.
Q11i) Gill nets do not recognize wild verse hatchery fish and there is no limit on the number of nets.
Q24) Selecting 1 or 2 would be the opposite of Q23.
Q26) At cabinet level - none. Local level "4"
- 8024 Q2) This question is too general. There are areas that are clearly impacted and others that have no problems.
- 8025 Q5) Nothing that can't be solved by common sense.
Q6c) Access to some areas.
Q8:5) I leave this to the forest managers and hope that they are right.
Q9) I want to know WHO says this is an ecologically sensitive area? Sierra Club and other rabidly environmental group saying so just doesn't cut it!
Q11a) And all the other fish! "1"
Q11f) Engineering changes could fix this. "2"
Q11l) Environmentally correct organizations "1"
Q24) Management is not a computer program. Management is trouble shooting. Check the problem - corner it - kill it!
Q26) There are many good people in both of these agencies. They are capable and able to manage these western states. However, politics being what they are, are at the present time handcuffed.

- 8028 Q3c) Endangered species laws should be strengthened and expanded.
 Q6c) Grazing, logging are extensive. Crowding on otherwise unimpacted areas is significant.
 Q8:5) People who choose to live in dangerous areas should assume responsibility for their risk.
 Q9i) Depends on whose definition is used.
 Q24) Difficult to evaluate without specifying management activities. I note that no attention is given a no - management option. From long experience, I am cynical about our knowledge and abilities re: management.
 Q26) Examination of eastside documents recently produced by these agencies suggests little reason for optimism. Inclusion of such old-line reactionary types such as Chad Oliver is not encouraging. It is interesting to compare and contrast Westside documents with Eastside. Eastside often seem thinly disguised and apologetic for old practices and distort both the scientific and historical record for the transparent business as usual purposes.
- 8029 Q11i) Hatcheries "1"
 Q24) Prioritize road closures and other restoration activities conducted first.
- 8030 Q1e) ...and animals and plant lives don't have more right than people.
 Q3g) We have old growth in our national parks.
 Q3h) That timber should be harvested.
 Q6c) Grazing.
 Q9d) It would depend on regulation.
 Q24) If we have to have govt manage our public lands why don't we look at the way lumber companies manage their lands. For hunting, berry gathering, and a lot of other recreation these are the best sights to see.
 Q25) This expresses two opinions.
- 8031 Q2) Grazing.
 Q6c) Grazing-logging along roads.
 Q7:18) Not destroying anymore of our natural resources by grazing, logging, mining.
 Q11i) Grazing/Logging "1"
- 8032 Q3) The beaches at river entrances along the coast are public lands. There are herds of 200 to 250 seals-sea lions at every entrance. These animals eat 12-15 pounds of fish daily. They are protected under the Endangered Marine Animals Act that was recently modified to [permit the destruction of identified problem animals such as "Herschel" at the Ballard Locks. It will be very difficult to identify specific animals out of a herd of 200 who all eat salmon. I do fish for steelhead which were recently labeled a salmon and have found about half of them with teethmarks. They are the ones that escaped the seals and sea lions. Last year, 1993, when gill netting was permitted in the lower columbia river, most of the fish also had gill net marks.
 Q11i) The Native Americans gill nets in the Columbia about 1/8th mile apart on both

sides above the Bonneville. The nets are often strung across side stream entrances (which is illegal) and they use their boats to catch fish out of these side streams. The sports fishermen catch none to 10-20 fish each and release all wild fish. The nets do not release wild fish. I feel these modern nets and their use with power boats have contributed a great deal to the decline of the salmon.

8033 Q1d) Depends on how we live.

Q3h) Depends on situation, weigh costs and benefits.

Q6c) Jeeps and motorbikes-off road, logging, logging roads, road hunters during rifle season.

Q7:18) Restoration of biological diversity of plants and animals to as close as possible to pre-settlement conditions.

Q8:5) 4, and begin to reduce hazard thou debris management, thinning, pruning, and controlled burnings.

Q11l) Logging and road use in headwaters of anadromous watersheds and resulting sedimentation and warming.

Q24) Start with combination of highest priority, lowest risk (eg escaped and on less steep slopes controlled burn) and easiest access, and apply lessons learned to increasingly difficult situations. As such activities would be dispersed both geographically and temporarily.

8034 Q24) Use both and/or intermediate levels to achieve ecological goals.

8035 Q24) Combine the above two approaches depending on capabilities of land to produce growth. Enter more productive sites more often, less productive sites less often.

8036 Q6c) Grazing along trails, damage to a pond. Stumps of 500 year old trees. Views of the fragmented landscape.

Q7) Wilderness and ecological health are about the same.

Q8:5) In the face of declining species we should protect those parts of the ecosystem that are less than the HRV maximum.

Q14) Consensus of everyone, the default being no action above pre colonial era.

Q23a) Harvest and mimic are FS jargon for log and to be like. Logging and the removal of trees to the mill are not anything like a natural disturbance.

Q23d) Create snags and down woody debris.

Q23) What are "adjoining land values"? Human, habitat, wildlife.

Q24) 1 time restoration entry, no harvest, non-mechanized thinning, control (but allow to burn) fires.

8037 Q4 Q10) If you can believe what you read.

Q11l) Farming, fertilizer run-off "1".

Q13) Depends who do the work.

Q24) Get back to basics and do what the land needs instead of what small groups of

people want.

- 8038 Q6c) Noisy campers.
Q8:5) See #4, or areas with special values, old growth, riparian areas etc.
- 8040 Q24) Man has upset nature. No we must continue some practices we may not deserve but people are important too.
- 8042 Q11j k) Can be regulated "3".
Q13) How about state agencies?
- 8043 Q14) Users should decide-ranchers.
Q24) Leave things the way they are.
- 8044 Q24) I feel these questions leave to much open to be answered. Further classification would be necessary for an objective answer.
- 8046 Q24) For areas that are to be managed, I think the sole focus should be to mimic the natural history of the particular area; that is the natural disturbances of 150-500 years ago.
- 8048 Q24) Adaptive management first-some practices may be better on large blocks, others small. However, I like the idea of 1 better than 2.
- 8049 Q1e) Equal natural rights. In human systems, plants and animals are not provided equal rights.
Q3g) Stupid question! Lives of families and workers are not threatened.
Q6c) Grazing and logging have deteriorated the physical environment; watersheds were impacted.
Q8:5) Controlled burns should be actively pursued as a management tool on federal lands.
Q14) Items in no. 4 but with an appeals process for management decisions.
- 8050 Q8:5) We live in the high desert area of the CRB. Not qualified to answer.
Q13) One of the problems I view is allowing people to express an opinion they are not qualified to give.
Q24) Public consensus is not an alternative for scientific management by people with solid "hands-on" experience and without an agenda.
Q26) Please don't base management decisions on a survey. For instance - I live in the high desert without any practical knowledge of a tree and most of the respondents to this survey live in a city.
- 8051 Q11l) Indian fishing "2"

- 8053 Q6c) All of the above.
Q24) A variation of #2, on the managed landscape #2 is preferred with the assumption there are large blocks of unmanaged land or reserves.
- 8054 Q2) Public agencies are poor resource managers.
Q11) Practices not adequately studied for effectiveness (ie drawdown)
- 8055 Q8:5) Also use pesticides.
Q24) Leave the roads open in order to control the fires and seed grass when done burning.
- 8056 Q6c) Cows are in road. Logging trucks driving too fast on narrow curves. Weeds due to overgrazing. Chain saw noise.
Q8:5) Perhaps a mix of above to determine which works best as it seems "we" (including scientists) don't know very much.
Q11) Hatchery fish with lower genetic quality-slight threat.
Q12) We need fewer people and a sustainable economic system.
Q13) The Forest Service should be a part of the Interior, not USDA. USDA "2", Interior "4".
Q14:4) But only within the context of environmentally driven, rather than economically driven parameters.
Q23) Although I can rank preferences, I really feel many of the above have their place.
Q24) Combine both strategies and compare outcomes over time along many dimensions.
Q26) Forest Service should not be USDA, should be Interior. Too much political and economic influence.
- 8058 Q2) You can't leave dead and dying trees in the woods. Needs complete management.
Q8) Fire is a management tool.
Q24) Intense management for all uses indefinitely.
- 8059 Q6c) Reduced aesthetics due to the presence and impacts of cattle.
- 8060 Q6c) Visual blight-clearcutting, crowding also increased.
- 8061 Q6c) Extensive use of snowmobiles, trail motorcycles and now jet skis. Noise, aesthetic disruption. Logging of previously unlogged areas of trails etc. Grazing creating a mess in wilderness.
Q9a-d) Decisions need to be science based, with objective of ecological health. I do not prefer clear cutting per se, but if it is necessary to deal with a problem then it probably should be done.
Q11) Everything total is a threat to some degree. The problem is quantifying and

- negotiating a solution.
- Q12) I believe that the socioeconomic costs will not be as high as many believe. I hope I am right!
- Q13) I am sorry but I cannot view things this way. All of these institutions do what they do based on thin interests, laws, customs etc. None are untrustworthy. For your figures, I will give blanket "4" ratings. However, some of these institutions will have to change.
- Q14) We simply have to work through our current (or new) institutions. How could the public make such decisions? They would simply have to recreate their own and eventually similar institutions.
- Q23g) Did this ever exist?
- Q23) This doesn't make good sense to me. Different methods would work in different situations. No single one can be the answer.
- Q24) This should be based on where one has the smaller overall impact. That should have come out of this analysis.
- Q26) Again, this is not a reasonable way to look at this. Both agencies have great ability, and have done what they have been doing based on past laws, customs perceptions etc. Both must (and are) change, but trust is too value ridden.
- 8062 Q2) Especially grazing and over-harvesting trees and ruining streams and riparian areas.
- Q8) A very complex subject. Depends on definition of terms. Man caused and natural fires should be quickly suppressed when hot, dry, windy conditions would probably result in a conflagration. What is the "natural role of fires in forests"? Is someone convinced and trying to convince others that this is important for forest health a this is really a strategy to maintain and increase the USFS bureaucracy by giving them something to do? Only when they obey all the laws, re: species, streams, unstable steep slopes, old growth etc.
- Q24) Secure protection of all roadless areas over 1,000 acres, then #1.
- 8064 Q11) Too many biologists messing with salmon beds.
- Q24) Treat smaller areas and let them recuperate before doing more.
- 8065 Q2) Of course there are problems. We learn as we move through life. But that is no reason to stop living or to use our resources.
- Q6c) The only thing I don't like when I am relaxing are radios. We moved a little ways and was OK.
- Q23a) In some cases clear cutting would be better.
- 8066 Q23a) Large area stand replacement fires should not be mimicked nor should volcanic eruptions.
- Q23c) Especially when thinning from below in overstocked stands.
- Q23e) Not during high or extreme fire danger or when fire is doing heavy resource damage.

- Q24) A combination of the above.
- 8067 Q2) Poor question -no opportunity to note poor environmental condition due to a lack of management.
- 8068 Q6c) Grazing in camping areas. Logging impacts in the area.
 Q11l) Water transportation "2".
 Q14) This must be the national public not just local interests.
 Q23g) In current roadless areas and lands that have been relatively undisturbed.
 Q24) A mix of 1 & 2, depending on need urgency of action #1 and where there is less urgent need for action #2.
- 8069 Q6c) Noise, crowding.
 Q11l) Hatchery "1".
- 8070 Q1c) Remembering that humans come first.
 Q2) Diseased forests, pollution from Canadian industry.
 Q3d) ESA has gone too far-scientific data has been biased ie Owl study.
 Q3i) Need balance.
 Q11) Many easterners have no idea what life is in the west. I feel the media is biased-depends on who takes the poll. It seems too many top positions are political appointments anymore. Depends on politics too much.
 Q14) I believe the USFS and BLM land belongs to individual states under the equal footing clause of the constitution. State and local governments should be stewards of this land.
 Q23d-g) I cannot conceive of these.
 Q26) I'm sure both agencies have some good people but the agencies have turned political and no longer adhere to the original purpose.
- 8071 Q6c) The only interference was the road closures that prevented access to portions of the stream.
- 8072 Q24) Cause no harm.
- 8073 Q24) Re instate multiple use concept and best and most efficient use of resource lands.
- 8074 Q6c) I coordinate a volunteer group conducting bio-diversity surveys in the Okanagan NF our trips are not quite recreational.
 Q11j) This the only threat because the fisheries are in such decline from other abuses (d-h).
- 8075 Com) Good show folks-I rewrote one question. Non e of your questions deal perceptions of ecological trends, only current conditions, or why conditions are the

way they are.

Q2) Bad question. Public lands improving over 30-50-75 years.

Q24) Diverse multiple use management that is site specific. No large blocks of anything, either wilderness or clearcut.

8076 Q11l) Massive dam release of water "1".

8078 Q8) We should bring most fuel loads back to reasonable levels through adaptive management and then use fire as a management tool.

8079 Q3g) How about equal.

Q3h) Sometimes, depends on the case.

Q8) No suppression except major damages to humans (not property).

Q9h) How about other forms of pest management?

Q9i) Depends on how selective.

Q13) Whether we want it or not all of these will have influence (1-12).

Q23) These aren't things that can be marked in priority. I would say for example that all need to be done.

Q26) Individuals within mean well but don't much of a sense of how to effectively involve outsiders.

8080 Q2) Just what government has caused.

Q3b) Less due in part to ESA.

Q6c) Tourism. The government promoting tourism is causing over-crowding and causing environmental damage.

Q7:18) Putting govt to do the job they were elected for, not running earth.

Q8:5) Make the Forest Service clean up logging slash. Remove all fell trees from logging area.

Q11l) EPA and ESA "1"

8081 Q8:5) Suppressing efforts should be balanced with resource conditions and needs in the area of the fire.

Q9) Does selective mean high grade or even-aged, individual tree selection? My answer is based on the latter definition.

Q11) In some small or large way each of these factors have effected salmon populations. I personally feel dams have the largest effect.

Q24) What about an approach which focuses on resource needs and not economic needs. Do what's right for the resource and take what products are available at that time.

Q26) It is not so much the agencies, but the individuals directing the project. Particularly the science team leader.

8082 Q6c) The effects of logging and grazing.

- 8083 Q8:5) Cut all bad timber, get the forest service to start managing our forests.
Q24) Get each community involved and get their opinion.
- 8084 Q6c) Motorized watercraft.
Q8:5) More discretion and study and consensus needed concerning the issues.
Q11l) Politics.
Q14) This is strongly dependent on level of understanding and resources available for analysis.
Q24) There is merit in each approach based on the sensitivity of the watershed and it is conceivable that both approaches could be used on large watershed dependent on the management needs.
- 8085 Q1e) Humans need to stop developing.
Q6c) Impacts to the landscape are easily viewed and obvious.
Q23a) No harvesting on public lands.
Q24) Our watersheds are seriously degraded. No further land management activities involving extraction.
- 8088 Q2) This question is totally unfair. You are asking a question that may or may not relate to your first sentence. It appears you are leading the question by trying to change the outcome of the answers.
- 8089 Q6c) Cattle grazing in wetlands surrounding recreation lake. Overgrazing is very prevalent in some areas here. Some resorts here are over crowded and sewage disposal is unregulated as to expansion facilities.
Q11l) Bird predation "1". I feel the water level is not the main issue here. I feel that altering dam operation will have a negative effect and that predators and harvesters of salmon should be aggressively pursued. Also, how about introducing a less hardy species to distract predators.
Q24) Define areas of concern and commercial potential and rank them. Then apply intensive management activities to those areas of lesser interest. Encourage habitat in most remote and less attractive and most desirable recreationally.
- 8090 Q6c) Crowding.
- 8091 Q7:18) Balance of production, economics and healthy environment.
Q8:5) #3 above plus pesticides, logging and all other management tools and approaches.
Q24) 2 should be the general, long-term approach with use of number 1 in situations needing "corrective" or "intensive" "preventative" attention.
- 8093 Q9b) Need to take enough to correct infested areas.
- 8094 Q3g) Humankind will take care of the land and foliage.

- Q7:18) All of the above.
Q24) Private management to take better care of the land and bring in more returns.
- 8095 Q8:5) Fire is only tool in forest management.
Q23) We should be out in the forest using commercial thinning, salvage logging and proven silviculture practices. Get something done.
Q24) I'm a tree farmer and believe active management can help solve our timber problems. The do nothing attitude of the past several years is a disgrace. We need a real leader to handle our public lands-I'm hoping.
- 8096 Q6c) Cow dung in river camps!
Q111) Fish biologists "2".
Q13) Where is executive branch? "5".
- 8097 Q6c) Other recreationists.
Q111) Researchers "1".
- 8098 Q8:5) Use a combination of silviculture and prescribed fire to ensure forest health and provide economic benefits.
- 8099 Q111) Excessive jet boats over fishing salmon runs on Snake river "1".
- 8100 Q8:5) We should not suppress natural fire but those started by man.
- 8101 Q6c) Clearcuts.
- 8102 Q24) Combination of full/selected management activities depending on local situation and geography as prescribed by professional managers.
- 8103 Com) I won't finish your survey until you and others acknowledge that things aren't a 1 or 5 or even a 3-neutral. This situation is going to stay polarized! Neutral isn't an opinion. You allow me real opportunity for an honest answer.
- 8104 Q6c) Seems there is always the sound of a chainsaw or motorcycle.
Q23a) Selective harvesting.
Q23g) This is what will happen after several million dollars have been spent on coffee, donuts, speakers, consultants, studies etc.
Q24) Depends entirely on the effect on water quality, that should be the first consideration (Portland's Bull Run water supply should be a good example).
- 8105 Q6c) Too many people resulting in crowded camping, litter, noise, and competition for hunting and fishing resources. Logging has opened many areas to vehicle access creating the same problems listed above. Overgrazing in some areas has reduced visual quality of lands and reduced streamside cover.

- Q11l) Increasing human population "1".
- 8107 Q6c) Grazing in wilderness areas, logging.
 Q9c) Case by case basis; not as an excuse to enter roadless areas.
 Q9e) To protect ecological resources.
 Q11c) Natural threat. Seals eat some salmon but nature maintains a balance until humans have upset that balance.
 Q12) Restoration of salmon is the best way of helping economic basis of region on long term. Cutting back logging now to a sustainable level will ensure timber jobs in the future as well.
 Q23) In wilderness or roadless areas this is appropriate-previously managed areas may or may not be appropriate.
 Q24) Reduced cut level is essential for ecological stability of CRB.
- 8108 Q24) Uncertain-maybe some of each.
- 8109 Q11l) Flushing of salmon "1".
- 8112 Q6c) Speedboats and jet skis, snowmobiles, logging saws, ORV, ugly clear cuts.
 Q8:5) We must allow natural fire to burn.
 Q9c) Depends on what the real scientists say.
 Q9i) Only if scientists agree, not the Forest Service, timber beasts or timber specialists.
 Q24) Bad question! Leading! There are other options. Assumption that all areas need management activity. It is not necessary to do management activities over the entire watershed! There are some areas that need to be left alone long and short term!
 Q25) Not for site preparation, for timber sale. Fire only to emulate natural causes.
 Q26) Concerned about the people and politics. I don't know that facts and science will really be needed. People are not part of the equation. A new agency needs to be started-Dept of Natural Resources-only scientists! No politicians or timber hogs.
- 8113 Com) Please save our fisheries, forests and wildlife for future generations.
 Q8:5) Very concerned that we have already topped the ecological balance.
 Q13) What about media or conservation groups?
- 8115 Q3h) With good management practices this won't be a problem.
 Q6c) Crowding.
 Q9a-c) These methods all have their place on specific habitat types. Cannot be answered objectively.
 Q11f) 50% of problem.
 Q11l) Political power, Bonneville Power Administration "1".
 Q13:12-13) Both lack objectivity.
 Q23) Each tool can be appropriate in a given ecological condition and objectives to

be achieved. Can't rank these tools without more information.

Q24:1) Best for moist habitats.

Q24:2) Best for dry habitats.

8501 Q1a) A bible's myth taken beyond reason

Q1c) What the best stewardship balance for all to develop? If they die humans are next.

Q1d) The U.S.A. could accommodate three times the present population.

Q2) Due to the topography the system is fragile and care should be the minds of everyone.

Q3g) Everyone knows hemp is a superior paper source.

Q5) Nature constantly decays and erodes.

Q7q) Small-scale independent mining, recreational prospecting, rockhounding, wild herb gathering, spirit dancing

Q8e) Conduct modeling on super computing and see the damage fire does overtime.

Q9) Miner can't get to their claim except via pack animal and/or helicopter.

Q9h) Natural predators, hunters: yes

Q11l) Offshore ship which perform industries furniture building, canneries, cattle, shoemakers, and other activities for profit just outside the U.S. twelve mile limit to avoid U.S. tax laws and other restrictions.

Q14f) Professionals provides options and the people make decision they live here.

Q18) Quality of life without government intrusion.

Q23a) Your "Fallers" must be intimate with the forest. Plus use the "Super Computer Craig" for modeling the erosion rate, growth patterns, others.

Q23b) Use, "Super Computer Modeling" before becoming to "Fire Happy", fire can be ruinous

Q23c) Have forest personnel point out which firewood gathering can be collected to reduce excessive fuel levels.

Q23d) Better to fall the trees. don't girdle to "Nitrogen" fixers who provide N₂ to all living things. "No" v shaped dominos falling techniques use.

Q23e) People shouldn't build where fire, wind, lightning, and other elements favor fire.

Q23f) People shouldn't Man should not control nature. Nature has a lived where insects have long lived; Reason for insects to populate an area, man has not become wise to that reason.

Q23g) Remember the timeline is different than the money greedy grift humans profit motive.

Q24c) I feel management should stay as "nimble" as possible, to response to any and all possible occurrences, but this means the chiefs have to take the advise of the indians to make the team work in concert. Number two also answers the question of security. Hire a dowser and drill water wells for use to release stress on are as of the Columbia River Basin used most, but watch out for nuclear waste from Hanford 100 or more miles down the road.

Q25) Will the homeowner/landowner be charged a service fee for the above weather

- the landowner wants to or not? What other negatives will occur to my land and family.
- 8502 Q11l) habitat destruction in estuaries
Q13a,b,c) Should be combined
- 8503 Q3g) Logging old growth will not save timber workers from having to change!
Q6c) logging and grazing interfered with my ability to study the natural systems and to fully enjoy the trips.
- 8504 Q20, 1) Not currently, but a, c&f in the past.
Q26) In most cases the individuals in the Agencies have the ability and motivation. This does not mean they are allowed to carry out tasks.
- 8505 Q6c) grazing, past logging
- 8506 Q5) Few problems
Q24c) Either can be O.K.
- 8507 Q6c) It was difficult to experience the degradation occurring. I have not and will not return for recreational purposes only to gain greater knowledge to help contain the problems.
Q10) I am well aware of the problems w/ dams only ie. Grand Coulee.
Q23) [Girdle trees] I am not familiar w/ this or do not comprehend the wording!
Q26) Crooks out to fill quotas & rape our forest w/ no thought to the resulting forest health. I believe this is their motive.
- 8510 Q6c) Roads, stumps, cow pies
Q7) Basic Resource Productivity
Q8e) We should clearly define the future landscape over time and use any tools that pass the 7 testing.
Q14) To clarify a holistic 3-part goal including desired future conditions.
Q24c) Mimic natural disturbance regimes, sizes, and patterns over time and space.
- 8511 Q6c) crowding and irrigation--poor surface water mgmt.
Q11l) fish hatcheries can threaten genetics of native populations and compete for food with stocks.
- 8512 Q6c) noisy, smelly snowmobiles on a logging road closed to snowmobiles.
Q24c) Use approach 2 for 50% of the watershed leave the other 50% alone. Let nature run its course.
- 8513 Q14) Be a long time resident of the C.R.B.
Q20a) To a small degree.
Q22b,c) WSSA,WFFA

- 8514 Q11f) Dams are mitigated by hatcheries
- 8515 Q11f) Problem of the dams is being mitigated by transportation.
- 8518 Q3e) especially lower elevations
 Q8e) under burns are important too.
 Q23a) Lodge pole pine only
- 8519 Q6c) Sheep to enter area in another wk. Poor access to roads due to logging and crowding
 Q7) 1-9 yes. 10-17 no.
- 8521 Q23f) Salvage harvest supported
 Q24c) Sustainable flow of wood products in predictable & sufficient quantities.
- 8522 Q3a) Small town values are valuable.
 Q5) Too many people/too little H2O
 Q6a,5) LK. Roosevelt & Col. Nat. For.
 Q9g,h) Natural predator by birds best
 Q12) No assurance Salmon efforts will work. Columbia Basin Project worth billions
 Q13b) At a local level
 Local people make better decisions about their lands
 Q14) the top down mgmt is not working each local person should be involved
 Q17) MSFS
 Q22) Staunchly independent member of Lk. Roosevelt Forum
 Q23c,g) With new stoves good emission factors. Our area had 9000 yrs of Indian Burning.
 Q24b) Careful approach based upon soil temp and moisture. Continuum and runoff to aquifers.
 Q25a,b) depending on duration
 Q26b) Don't know
 if give local control-the people in the Col. Nat. For are quite knowledgeable and capable
- 8523 Q6c) Logging
 Q11l) Grazing
- 8525 Q2) Due to environmentalism
 Q7) See Attached
 Q9b) If necessary
 Q11l) Mis-Information, Environmental meddling in scientific areas
 Q13) Has no trust for environmentalist and they should have limited influence. Has a great deal of trust in the industry and they should have a great deal of influence.

- 8529 Q7) Minerals
- 8530 Q6c) Crowding
 Q8e) allow wilderness wildfire; introduce controlled fire in allocated timberlands-wildlife suppression has been as damaging to the environment as loss of timber is to the forest industry.
 Q9a,b,c) These are too site specific to be given one response.
 Q9f) controlled grazing-not eliminated
 Q11) This is a question for professional fisheries biologist.
 Q13) Given that the agency has qualified, ethical professionals
 Q14) Provide money & positions to hire qualified personnel many of whom have left your employment in disgust.
- 8532 Q8e) We should manage our forests for the betterment of all groups with the multiple use concept.
- 8533 Q6c) hunting (fear of being shot) grazing (destruction of springs & riparian area!)
- 8534 Q6c) grazing; fire suppressed stands of timber-dense & depressing
 Option 1 with 300 buffers on streams and is cutting above a 1:64 acre ratio.
- 8535 Q6c) motorbikes, snowmobiles, logging
 Q24) No management, other than putting RDS. to bed, and restricting human activity.
- 8537 Q6c) crowding, logging, grazing
 Q24c) Disperse selected mgmt activities - w/fish & wildfire goals for populations etc. you have left out # issues here!
- 8538 Q11) Poor structure to this question (Q-11)-No "possible" threat category. It's either "probable" or not a threat at all. I didn't answer this question on these grounds, since clearly, Uncertainty rules here scientifically- a poll won't answer it for you!
 Q24c) Define frequency of historic disturbance and prescribe mgmt to match it (Approximately,Anyway). This would lead to a range from intensive/short time frames to extensive/long time frames, depending on subbasin.
- 8539 Q11f) Canadian fishing
- 8540 Q6c) cows, horses
- 8542 Q6c) Jet boats on Snake sad sadly overgrazed
 Q8c) What does this really mean? It's subjective and makes your question difficult to interpret.
 Q13) [How much influence] Versus what? Congress, courts, ballots, and Neo-Nazis?

- Q13:2) But it seems that the FS may be starting to change...(?)
 Q13: 10,11,12,13) According to whom?
 Q14) Continue to use the checks and balances of the 3 branches of government as is.
 Q23) I do not see these as equivalent categories to be ranked. They should all be used to meet different conditions. Ranking is inappropriate.
 Q24c) Much more specific data would be needed. What is a "concentrated period"? How much extraction? 1. Less extraction 2. Non-extractive management targeted to finer-grained landscape units such as dominant vegetation habitat types.
 Q25) Great Question! A hard one!
- 8543 Q3a) Take away all the nets from the people fishing.
 Q3b) Close all fishing for a couple of fish spawning cycles.
 Q3d) Come to the middle ground
 Q3i) Multiple use is best.
 Q5) Problems exist, however they can be addressed and solved without over reacting either way.
 Q6c) People noise, motorcycle, boat, and snowmobile noise. The use is OK if they were not so noisy.
 Q8e) Suppress wildfires in all federal forests and use controlled fire protect forest health
 Q9) Keep the roads open for fire protection and for the use of us old people who enjoy the drives in the woods.
 Q11f) Fish ladders were designed many years ago for passing fish.
 Q23d,e,f,g) I would not consider any of these options
- 8544 Q6c) motorcycling, motorboats, logging
 Q11l) Destruction of vanishing wetlands
 Q24c) If forced to choose between the two option I would choose the first one, although, I would prefer that we begin to use alternative fibers like Knapp or other non-wood sources that have a higher annual yield.
- 8546 Q11l) Hatchery Mgt.
- 8547 Q7) Mining
 Q11l) Use of bad science to justify agency and/or environmental extremists goals.
 Q13a) Administration
 Q14f) This depends on the technical and professional guidance need it apply about opinions and decisions.
 Q20) You forget mining!!
 Q22) You always forget mining!
 Q24c) Demand honesty and good science from agencies, and leave as is.
 Q26) Upper management, no trust. Field management - moderate trust.
 COM: The best example of biased lack of realism so your continuing bias against

mining in all documents, presentations and publicity. Also, the lack of practiced mining experts on any of your teams or advisory groups.

8549 Q3) Balance is the key.

Q11a) They kill

Q11i) They kill salmon

Q23a) --Pushing over trees etc? Does not make sense in a commercial forest

Q23e) In a state -w/5mm population-get serious.

Q23g) Same as above plus ownership pattern

8551 Q8e) Reintroduce fire to manage forests back to seral/mioseral stages

8553 Q6c) crowding, noise

Q24c) Restoration activities need be focused over an entire watershed. Harvest and management should be in smaller units possibly more frequently.

Q26) Seems to be changing or improving to warrant more trust.

8556 Q6c) clearcuts destroy natural beauty.

Q8) Somewhere between no.s 3 & 4. Too much management has occurred in many areas to allow fires to just burn naturally everywhere.

Q9) Assuming selective means thinning or cutting and leaving a high quality stand remaining? ie ecoforestry?

Q13) These agencies have the potential to manage successfully, but a great deal of reform within would need to occur first, and a different direction taken than present pandering to timber, ranching, mining interests.

Q23) I can't do this as these would not be my personal choices for management, and because there are too many variables depending on area, previous management activities etc.

8557 Q11) Foreign Fishing Industry

Q23) Harvest Commercially.

8558 Q2) You have not defined environmental problem; do you mean: unsuitable/unable to support human life or that ecological status has changed due to human activity or what? Yes there are problems but the question of scale needs to be addressed.

Q6c) In general, productive uses did not interfere w/my "experience"; loud music and flute and drum playing were aggravating!

Q7) All are important.

Q24) Depends on the objectives!

8559 Q24) No management - leave it alone.

8560 Q8) We should allow fire to resume its natural role in forests and not suppress it, even if it threatens human life or property.

- Q24) Stop all human activity creating need for "management" and let nature take its course in all other matters. I reject that management is needed at all.
- 8561 Q24) Close all public lands to commercial use, obliterate roads, allow ecosystems to restore for at least a hundred years.
- 8562 Q6c) Cows and backpackers don't mix at all.
- 8563 Q6c) Crowding, noise, cows, chainsaws, ORV's, ATV's.
 Q14) Professionals collect info. and managers make decisions with public input.
 Q23a) Not possible.
 Q24) An adaptive management approach is necessary. Everyone has to commit and be involved along the whole ecosystem.
- 8564 Q6c) Grazing, noise, logging.
 Q24) Same as #2 except include "over relatively large areas".
- 8567 Q6c) Rules restrictions assumption on part of administrations that I am doing something wrong.
 Q26b) The agency is not a person it is a politic.
- 8568 Q24) Impossible to answer without more information.
- 8570 Q14) Resource professionals must decide but need to seek qualified input from public to make best informed decisions.
 Com: The survey questions did cause me a great deal of concern. My problem is that they seem to invite polarization rather than explore the opportunities for common ground. Consider Q3 where we are asked to rate our agreement with the statement that "the economic livelihood of local communities should be given the highest priority when making decisions concerning public lands." While I believe, as do most of us in the forest industry, that local economic considerations are not receiving proper attention in the public lands decision making process, we do not advocate meeting these needs at any cost which the term "highest" requires. To the contrary, a rationale ecosystem based on review of the inland forests will show huge opportunities for sustainable timber management as an integral part of ensuring other ecosystem health values. Forcing a stark choice of one use over all others for our forests is the overly simplistic, highly polarizing approach which has led to so much controversy over federal forest policies.
- 8573 Q24) Selected activities, but determine which ones, size, duration, and periodicity to reflect situation.
- 8574 Q6c) Cow pies offend me as do cows and sheep, especially in camp grounds! Destruction of riparian areas is so foolish.

- Q7) Watershed protection.
- 8575 Q6c) Too much noise in camp ground.
- 8576 Q6c) Logging (clear cutting) destroys visual characteristics of the area, creates mono-cultures of disease-susceptible species (eg firs instead of ponderosa pine).
- 8577 Q2) My answer does not imply that the serious environmental problems are to be blamed on a specific management practice. It merely reflects the fact that we have some things to work on!
- Q3e) Ecosystem mgmt, not preservation!
- 8578 Q3e) Only if non-wilderness roadless lands are preserved somehow, nearby to take recreational pressures off wilderness itself.
 Q3h) Natural needs definition. This issue ties in with fire and native american land management practices. Transitional policies may require conventional means.
 Q6c) Fresh cow pies, Elk dropping would be much more aesthetic.
 Q8) I favor a return to fire management practices of native americans.
 Q24) Hire foresters free from political and economic influence to be in charge at specific areas the way the Swiss do, and our USFS used to do.
- 8579 Q3g) When does old growth become non-growth forest?
 Q6c) People - but they were easy to get away from.
 Q11l) Reservoir draw downs.
 Q12) Turn our salmon recovery to private enterprise.
 Q24) Conduct the full range of management activities over selected blocks of the watershed, resulting in intensive management with longer periods of rest for these blocks.
- 8580 Q2) We have a forest management problem which is not an environmental problem.
 Q11l) Release of diseased hatchery fish.
- 8582 Q6c) Had to chase cows out of campsite twice. Logged areas ugly and water supply disappears as streams dry up. Grazing ruins river banks. Hunting camps in natural forest unsightly. Garbage left around campsite like piles of uneaten mashed potatoes.
- 8583 Q3g) Survival depends upon preservation!

- Q3h) Exotic - No, Native - Yes.
 Q6c) Cows are everywhere, too many clear cuts, too much logging.
 Q8) Use control burns too!
 Q9i) Depends who will determine selective harvesting levels?
 Q26a) Just visit any BLM rangeland.
 Q26) Lots of good people work for these agencies but they are frustrated by Agency Administrators. When I worked for the USFS all the Chiefs cared about was logging and cows. In addition, congress is heavily influenced by logging and ranching interests-this is not an interest in jobs but in power and wealth.
- 8587 Q6c) Using the river banks to get into and out of the Columbia River. No one wants to pay extra to use the water.
 Q8) Save the forest floor for mulch of new growth.
 Q11) Seals, walrus, otters, bears "1".
 Q23e) Don't let fires destroy mulch for new forests (hold the moisture).
 Q24) On all steep hillside (clear a 95 to 30 ft strip across each creek to allow fire fighting equipment to cross small streams to stop fires from funneling up the gorges and cleaning all creek shade and protection.
 Q26) I have seen too many streams ruined by clear-cutting, skidding downhill etc. All forests should have a stream protector present while logging is going on!
- 8588 Q11) Bureaucratic mismanagement by the USFS "flushing smolts" program. "1".
- 8589 Q6c) Visual impact of logging and grazing. Noise from ORVs and military jets in wilderness areas. Obvious impact on biodiversity due to resource extraction.
 Q13) Environment grassroots community "5"
 Q13:1-7) These agencies groups tend to serve own budgets and interests.
 Q23) In all of the above leave wilderness and roadless areas alone. Minimal intensive management over large blocks with long rotation. Also, large blocks left unmanaged.
 Q26) In long run, agencies tend to serve corporate desires and cave into congressional pressure.
- 8590 Q23a) Only in areas where logging is allowed. Not in roadless areas.
 Q23d) Don't understand the function of this one.
 Q23e) We have a problem with air pollution with this one.
 Q23g) If we did not have current fuel build ups this would be my #1 preference.
- 8591 Q23c) Downed timber only.
 Q24) Intensive management to return health to forests then #2.

- Q26) Budget constraints does not allow either agency to do their jobs fully.
- 8593 Q1e) When casting this into a "rights" framework, this question sets off a lot of conflicting dysfunctional and philosophical problems.
Q2c) Don't mix the 2 _ timber and range.
Q6c) Grazing animals reduces vegetation. Contaminated water supplies.
- 8594 Q8) Suppress wildfire to protect important resource values otherwise allow fire to resume its natural role.
- 8595 Q6c) Clear-cutting is everywhere and it makes a trip to the mountains depressing. Without exaggeration, the destruction of our forests has made the city an escape from mans greed in the country.
Q7: 1-9) These are all important.
Q8) We should not use any pesticides. We have created a real problem now and we need to carefully study how to fix the mess...No decisions should be made based on timber production.
Q9i) Stop using disease and infestations as an excuse to log!
- 8597 Q6c) Overgrazing - Cheat grass etc.
- 8598 Q6c) Overcrowding in campgrounds.
Q8) A combination of 2 and 3.
Q24) Use #2 in accordance to needs of wildlife disease, insects and overall health of forest. Allowing for less waste of timber.
- 8602 Q11i) The salmon have been gone from the upper Columbia River for over 50 years and that is the way it is. Hydro Power is better than coal or nuclear power, would you think so?
- 8606 Q2) This is a management problem, not an environmental problem!
- 8608 Q1) Reverence for life?
Q3a) "1" But should be given attention.
Q3e) Unmanaged wilderness areas in all basic habitats not just rock and ice.
Q3g) There is a wide disparity between a job and survival in a biological sense. A timber workers job may be lost by protecting old growth but his/her survival will be enhanced by protecting intact ecosystems.
Q3h) With harvest of some usable boardfeet appropriate.
Q3i) Ecosystem mgmt.
Q6c) Grazing cattle in streams mucking and manuring, overgrazing destroying native

- habitat and valuable watersheds.
- Q9a) Not high grade.
- Q9d,e) Unfortunately means more governmental control.
- Q14) Resource professionals should manage the land in the best long term interest of the land and the public, but they have not done so. Therefore the public has had to act as a watchdog and will need to continue to do so.
- Q23a) Clearcuts do not equal fire openings.
- Q23d) When discriminately evaluated.
- Q23f) With harvest of some usable boardfeet appropriate.
- 8609 Com) It is essential that a true scientific evaluation be done on our public lands before anything else is done. Then we need to begin to factor in compromise or whatever, the economic and social factors. But they have nothing to do with the scientific factors! The roadless areas must be left alone. There is such a small percentage left. They are not the place for adaptive management areas etc. Don't manage these areas. Nature has done much better than our agencies.
- 8612 Q1e) These questions are worded so strongly, the responses don't seem adequate. I am not neutral but wording makes it the most I can do.
- Q3g) What amount of old growth? All, half? We do not want to lose all old growth nor do we feel we need to in order to save an industry that is renewable and necessary to the entire country.
- 8613 Q1c,e) These are poorly worded for me, but given the alternatives I strongly agree.
- Q6c) No salmon/steelhead/cutthroat to fish for! Silted streams! Giardia! Loss of habitat! Real impacts, not just scenics!
- Q8d) and controlled fire should be used in managed lands to restore us back to a natural fire regime.
- Q9i) Cant prevent and don't want to.
- Q13) The forest Service and BLM, I trust many of their scientists, but not many of their managers or regional supervisors.
- Q14) The tribes have co-management treaty rights and should be recognized as having a large role.
- Q23b) On already managed lands.
- Q24) The amount of disturbance at any given time in a watershed must go down and where are the other management tools-doing nothing is mgmt.
- 8614 Q24) Set some areas aside for timber production and manage for maximum production.
- Q26) There are certainly people with motive and ability if they were allowed to use them.

- 8615 Q6c) Grazing and logging are ruining what remains of natural system. Noise of jet boats on river intolerable.
Q14) In a much more comprehensive fashion than presently occurs. 4: Waste of time agency doesn't know how to do this.
Q24) No commercial exploitation of public land. Alternatives above do not give sufficient information.
Q25) Only "somewhat" because I have trouble accepting hypotheses.
- 8617 Q6c) Noise, teenagers, logging
- 8620 Q6c) Noise, shooting.
Q24c) Don't try so hard to improve mother nature. We always screw up when we "manage".
- 8622 Q9b) Whichever one best suits the situation.
Q9d) Protect ecosystem and you do not need more laws.
Q9f) Timing of grazing, when and how long and you need more laws.
Q9g) Whichever fits the situation.
Q11i,j,k) Everything threatens salmon existence when there are only a few salmon. These do not effect a healthy salmon run.
- 8623 Q2) Yes, due to lack of management of the resource.
Q3e) Enough is enough.
Q3) All these questions lead you to either/or situations - biased environmentalist view.
Q14) Privatize public lands write 20 year mgmt plans and monitor; in 20 years renew.
- 8624 Q6c) Clearcuts were visible and trail had been shortened one mile due to logging.
Q8e) Like #4 but forests are too fragmented and in too poor health for this so some controlled fires may be necessary.
Q9c) This means different things to different folks.
Q24c) Minimize intrusion. Use "friendly" means of intrusion where necessary-eg livestock rather than heavy equipment. Concentrating piles of slash before burning may bake the soil and kill microorganisms.
- 8625 Q6c) Crowds, unsightly logging practices.
Q8d) Human caused fires should be suppressed.
Q24c) Disperse selected management activities and allow long rest periods to evaluate effectiveness.
- 8626 Q3g) Economic or physical? If economic, What does survival mean? The survival

- of particular jobs or industry or what? This is a rhetorical but basically meaningless question.
- Q6c) Grazing, dams.
- Q9) You 3 very similar logging alternatives (what's the difference between a and c?) but no fire alternative? This is biased?
- Q23) Over long term, after fire suppression caused problems are dealt with, natural processes such as insect outbreaks and wildfire should be left to run their course.
- 8628 Q6c) Grazing logging, crowding, poor road construction, poor fishing damaged streams.
- Q8e) Same as #4 but include restoration of fire dependant plants by stopping grazing and replanting programs.
- Q11l) traditional farming practices "1"; Highway Mtce Programs "1"
- Need to emphasize forest and grassland restoration in all alternatives. This means deferring some traditional uses for long rest periods: Defer grazing in areas where key fire dependant plant species have been eliminated or severely reduced by grazing until ecosystem health is restored (this may take 50 or more years). Prescribed fire management in areas where many of the original fire dependent species have been eliminated by grazing may be of questionable value. Defer timber harvest in all remaining old growth and roadless areas. Establish large RNA, Ecosystem Baseline "Refuge" areas.
- It appears that traditional research may have been driven more to serve range and timber needs rather than to simply describe "cause and effect" relationships between these uses and natural systems. All approaches to watershed/landscape restoration will probably need a good dose of new research with a holistic ecosystem objective in mind.
- 8629 Q24c) As long as long term means multi - generational and looking at entire process over time and space.Q 26) Answers do to an ever changing direction by both depts. Strongly motivated and driven by political pressures and personal agendas.
- 8630 Q2) No management will result in disease and insects and lastly fire.
- Q5) Use the land or lose it!
- Q23) Try to use selective harvesting wherever possible to utilize timber and protect future stands.
- 8632 Q11l) Ocean-commercial fishing.
- 8633 Q5) We will have serious environmental problems when the dead timber burns and ruins watersheds.
- Q11l) Walleye, introduced by the Washington Dept of Wildlife.

- Q24c) Log the dead and dying immediately. Leave small blocks of old growth forever. Use the forests Like a farmer or rancher uses his land. He takes care of it because its his love and livelihood.
- 8636 Q6c) Crowds, logging clearcuts are devastating.
- 8637 Q2h) This entirely depends on the site.
 Q7c) Crowding, some logging practices, grazing in riparian areas.
 Q24) This is insane since it precludes adaptive management. Since we have no idea what the effects of these new techniques will be on degraded sites, we need to do a little at a time, THEN MONITOR and ADAPT and change if the result is poor.
 Q26) I have trust in the individuals' motives abilities and motives, but much less trust in the agencies' abilities and motives.
- 8638 Q3a) Must be balanced with public trust obligations nationally.
 Q3b) Prefer ecosystem approach over single species emphasis.
 Q3c) In rare cases.
 Q3f) Plants are often less adaptable than charismatic megafauna - very narrow habitat needs.
 Q3g) No obligation to unsustainable economy. Govt should assist in transition.
 Q3h) Only in a few cases, including wilderness.
 Q3i) Maintain grazing as a tool for watershed and wildlife management. Commodity production should take priority only on the vast acreage of private rangelands, if that's what the owner wants. Watershed and wildlife should have precedence on public lands.
 Q6c) No last trip, specifically. Generally I select areas with less commodity production for recreation. Sometimes disturbed to find remote high elevation meadows have had cows trailed up. High percentage of bare ground indicates unsuitable range, also conflicts with summer elk forage.
 Q8) Mostly not feasible to return to natural role immediately because of fuel buildup. Need to burn for transition period.
 Q9d) Need more creative, incentive-based management.
 Q9f) again, incentives are more likely to succeed politically. Q9g) only if bio-control and mechanical inadequate.
 Q9h) Generally not yet cost-effective.
 Q9i) Where needed. But pathogens/insects are part of the ecosystem, too.
 Q13) Bizarre question. Must be a balance between local and national values and professional science. the fed agencies have not done well in the past finding this balance. I'm optimistic that more prof. science will come to light.
 Q14) I'm comfortable with NEPA process, if done in good faith and full disclosure.

- 8644 Q7c) Livestock in Hells Canyon
 Q8) Need control burning in the late fall season.
 Q11l) Feedlots adjoining streams and rivers on private and public lands.
 Q23a) Fall burns
 Q23e) Spray when needed
 Q23f) Wilderness areas only.
 Q24) The USFS lands have been an experiment since mid-1950s! A new concept plan will only last the length of the present administration.
- 8645 Q24) For specific site approval 1 is best; for other site approach 2 is best.
- 8647 Q24) Remove all restrictions from private property except by Due Process. Take the federal government out of all public lands as declared by the constitution. Let the government serve, not control the people.
- 8649 Q7c) Over cutting, clearcuts deforestation - agri - rights up to edgers - wild "strips."
 Q11l) Ignorance "1"
 Q24) Manage primarily for habitat and ecosystem health. Sorry, do not have the science to understand which is less impact.
 Q26) Too long in hands of industry.
- 8650 Q24) Conduct the full range of management over small areas with less intensive management for short period of time with longer periods of rest.
- 8653 Q2) Present policy of no management has created serious fire and waste problems.
 Q3h) Old growth is protected under park system and existing forest plans.
 Q6c) This is a loaded question. Government people who take surveys, destroy past improvements and do little for their pay always start my float trip off on a poor note.
 Q11l) Present forest rules are adequate, in fact need more judgement - less 300'-150'-100' rules.
 Q24) Do something. \$ billion bdft of timber has died on eastside forests and little salvaged. No wonder this country is in debt. Use the existing forest plans. They took 17 years of development and area constantly evolving the plan. This new plan will do little more than put planners to work.
 Q26) Public pressure from east California (9th Circuit Court) etc. will not allow USFS and BLM to use their knowledge!
- 8654 Q9a-c) I favor using the method best suited to circumstances. Sometimes it is selective, sometimes clearcutting.
 Q9i) If it is appropriate method for the situation.
 Q24) Divide the watersheds into landscapes (about 10-15000 A); determine

management objectives for each landscape; manage to achieve the objectives landscape by landscape.

Q25) Assuming it isn't much and is of short duration - once or twice a year.

8655 Q6c) Excessive development.

Q111) Public attitude.

Q14) New management by natives (not of natives).

8656 Q111) Hatcheries - Curious why you didn't include this in the list since the threat they pose is widely recognized by scientists (and increasingly by the public).

Q12) There will be longer-term socioeconomic consequences if they do not survive.

Q24) Combination of 1 & 2, such as #1 over half of the area and #2 in the other half -- diversity of management.

8660 Q111) Hatchery competition.

8661 Q24) A combination of 1 & 2 is most realistic. Resource potential will dictate the level of intensity of management. Very intensive and extensive approaches need to be employed given the potential for the given resource to respond to achieve desired goals.

8663 Com) I have always considered myself an environmentalist, but this administration and the extreme environmentalists are turning environmentalist into a bad thing. Today's environmentalists want to stop logging, grazing and an industry you don't mention - mining.

Where do you people think the ink you typed with, the computer you used, the paper you used, the building you work in, the house you live in, the car you drive and the food you but come from?

All the above come from loggers, miners and ranchers. If you cut out the livelihood, where do we get all the goods we use and better yet where do we get our food?

People are talking about taking out the Dams in addition to the other industries I mentioned. How much are you willing to pay for your utilities? Or are you willing to go without electricity? If so how do you cook, wash clothes, or clean up with warm soap and water?

Please don't take our life away. Your turning America into a socialist country. I don't like it.

8664 Q24) Give nature a chance during favorable climatic conditions.

8665 Q6c) Trail disappeared in a clearcut. Motorcycle whines a mile away.

Q23a) In matrix areas maybe, in reserves no.

Q23) I strongly disagree with the assumptions in this question. It assumes a paradigm of landscape management rather than a system of conservation reserves.

Q24) Identify a system of conservation reserves, matrix areas and buffer zones. To the extent possible, use management tools in matrix areas and buffer zones more intensely for short periods in a way that meshes ecologically with natural processes occurring in conservation reserves.

8666 Q6c) Grazing - Stop the grazing!

8668 Q6c) Crowding.

Q9b) Not to exceed 30 acs. in size. Satisfactory tree stocking should be accomplished within 2 yrs.

Q9d) We have adequate protection now.

Q11) Tree nurseries need to use pesticides to control insects (eg USFS Bend Pine Nursery).

8669 Q11l) States Rights. Not willing to trade off other F/WL resources to help restore salmon.

Q23a) Only after ecological needs are met.

Q23e) Unless serious threat to private land or improvements - should get landowners to cooperate with prescribed burning.

Q23f) Once we are back within natural range of variability.

8670 Q14) Depends on the bias of the professionals. Need open minded professionals to make #3 work.

Q23g) The natural balance is so disturbed at this time that allowing nature to take its course would be devastating.

Q24) This would depend on location, wildlife species impacted, etc. These decisions should be made on a case by case basis, although in general I think #1 would be preferred.

Q26) Regardless of what is being said in DC, the local personnel have their own perceived constraints about what they can and cannot do due to local pressure and personal bias. On the ground actions do not mirror directions from DC.

8671 Q7:18) Mining.

Q26) Note: The USFS may be cleaning up their act. The BLM seems hopelessly incompetent. The secretary of the Interior is a boldface and unrepentant liar!!

8672 Q1e) Without harming each others rights to exist in perpetuity.

Q8:4) Or rare ecosystem attributes (old growth).

Q24:2) As long as you don't have to maintain a super road system to do it!

8673 Q11l) Hatchery Policies.

8674 Q6c) Too many people, too many roads.

Q11l) Any form of fishing can be threat, but its the most controllable.

8675 Q6c) Grazing and logging impacts were obvious in many places including water resource problems with agriculture...

8676 Q14) Act as full and equal partners after resource professionals identify the minimum requirements for maintaining ecosystem integrity.

8677 Q6c) Some places are crowded, some places overgrazed, logged. Other places on public land do not interfere with my enjoyment.

Q8) Same as #4 but add protection from fire for special use areas along with human lives and property.

Q11l) Hatcheries "2".

Q23d) If the purpose of this question is to create snag habitat for cavity dependent wildlife then the preferable method would be to blast or cut the top off. Girdling is a poor technique - the trees blow over in high winds.

Q24) A combination of 1 & 2. Use intensive concentrated efforts to reach goals and then less intensive to maintain.

Q26) I question the credibility of the USFS. Wildlife monitoring was supposed to be a major result of the last forest planning efforts (Land Use Plans). USFS commitment to monitoring was poor. I'm afraid we'll see a repeat of this lack of commitment with the ecosystem plan. Sorry, once bitten twice shy.

8678 Q3) Economic concerns should have equal or slightly higher priority. However, other concerns should have high priority. Wildlife, salmon, other environmental issues can be addressed without crippling our economic system and should be.

Q8) Some combination of 2 & 3 is most appropriate.

Q24) But include combinations of both IE and some vegetative and timber types might require one or the other approach.

8680 Q11l) Road Construction "1"

8681 Q6c) Length of camp occupation regulation in the Eagle Cap Wilderness.

Q11l) State and USFS Hatchery Management Policies "1".

8682 Q14) There is a need for regional planning agencies with elected representatives to

- guide major issues in the basin. Powell suggested a commonwealth form of government based on physical boundaries in the west. We need to revisit that idea from past century.
- Q24) Evaluate the physical and biological characteristics of the landscape to help decide which management strategy is appropriate given the disturbance regimes inherent to the watershed.
- 8683 Q3g) These families need to survive yes, but not through destruction of the resource that sustains them.
- 8684 Q14) Should use sound sciences to make management choices.
Q24) I don't know how you think you can write a management plan for such a large and diversified area and even close to right!
- 8685 Q23g) Time will heal wounds, but we lack time. In areas that haven't been manipulated by man, this is possible.
Establish goals for each area of the watershed (ie balance man/nature) and implement strategies to reach sound sustainable results.
- 8688 Q2) The swing is to reducing the problems through better management of resources.
Q23a) Volcanoes - 10,000 acre fire equals 10,000 acre clear cut.
Q23d) For what purpose?
- 8689 Q6c) Too many people.
Q11l) Lack of a balanced treaty agreement on off-shore salmon with Alaska and Canada.
Q24) Need more info to decide this.
- 8691 Q24) Slow and easy approach backed with complete research.
- 8692 Q24) Conduct full range of management activities on a rotating basis; more intensive, large periods of rest.
Q26) Having been a disgruntled federal agency employee, these agencies need improved management skills (of employees) at top; shift decision making to field level science.
- 8693 Q6c) Too many people.
Q8) We need to move towards (back to) a more natural role of fire, this needs to be managed. A combination of suppression, prescribed and natural fire is most appropriate.
Q24) We are going to need a combination of 1 & 2, which is appropriate will be

determined by present ecological health of each watershed area and the desired conditions we want to achieve.

- 8697 Q1b) Not exactly - but humans were given dominion over nature. They were created to glorify God.
Q11f) Depends on where it is. Dams can help too.
Q24) May want a combination of 1 & 2 depending on the circumstances.
- 8701 Q3a) If you had used the word "sustainability" here I might have answered differently.
Q8) #4 above plus use controlled, prescribed fire as a management tool.
Q24) My response to this would vary depending on the area and management techniques in question.
- 8702 Q14) Let the public who understand the issues (ie foresters, ranchers) act as full and equal partners in decision making.
- 8704 Q3i) Should be multiple use management.
Q23b) Thinning would be a better alternative.
Q23d) Too many dead trees out there.
Q23e) Too much dead and dying fuel.
Q23f) Take care of all the forest.
Q23g) Why let it go to waste?
Q26) These agencies have depleted their ability to manage by letting the general public make decisions that should be made using scientific data.
- 8705 Q6c) Recreationist camp grounds.
Q8) Combine 2 & 3.
Q11l) Ocean conditions "1"
Q14) Should be local control on management of federal property.
Q24) Maintain an aggressive salvage operation.
Q26) The present agencies hands are tied by the present leadership. With new and different leadership, these agencies would do an excellent job of management.
- 8706 Q6c) Crowding and Grazing.
Q11l) Hatcheries threat to wild runs.
- 8707 Q8) Let it burn no matter what.
Q9f) Elimination of livestock grazing.
Q14) Fulfill legal mandates for once.
Q23) Cant be done
Q24) Stop the idiocy. Neither of the above work.

- 8709 Q6c) Cow pies everywhere.
 Q8) We should examine the costs and benefits and risks of prescribed burning vs other methods to achieve objectives.
- 8710 Q3h) Use fire as a management tool!
 Q6c) Grazing to waters edge has deteriorated fish habitat ie poor fishing.
 Q8) Immediately add salvage logging to thin stands then introduce fire management.
 Q14) Independent university research should be utilized heavily in management decisions.
- 8713 Q1d) We are 500X the earths natural carrying capacity for mankind, 5 billion vs 10 billion.
 Q2) 1. Decreased forest productivity.
 2. Extinction of species and loss of genetic diversity and ecosystem stability.
 3. Production of toxic substances unalterable by natural processes.
 Q6c) Development is degrading the view.
 Q8) Controlled fires in spring when O2 is low or when weather conditions permit.
 Q11) Technology - Salmon migration routes and arrival times are known, fish finders, GPS etc. allow us to get very last one. Solution: 1) Limit technology use, 2) Reduce # of commercial licenses issued, 3) Build fish by pass at Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee.
 Q14) Legislation that requires ecological processes be used in decision making. Also, accountability and civil penalties for failure to do so.
 Q23) Timber harvests must not be allowed after prescribed burns or wildfires, or this will just become another harvest tool to replace clear cutting.
 Q24) Eliminate the manned space program, reduce logging, and put the money saved into forest and fish habitat restoration. The loss of salmon will be devastating to the world food web.
 Q26) These are politically controlled agencies and can only do the job if they have a mandatory law which requires them to use ecological processes in decision making and are held liable for not doing so.
- 8716 Q6c) Except we swam and I was concerned about agricultural runoff and sewage in the river. If appropriate, score my answer as a yes.
 Q13d) But they will have the greatest influence under the constitution.
 Q23d-f) All are equally objectionable to me.
- 8717 Q8) We should use timber harvest and controlled fire to achieve manageable fuel loads. Once this is achieved, let fire run its natural course.
 Q14) The resource professionals need to do a better job of getting info to the public.
 Q23d) Girdle trees, no. Create snags, yes.

Q23f) In some cases. Most of the time we don't need to do things right away. Often if we wait the problem goes away. A dead tree is not a wasted tree.

Q24) Each watershed is likely to be different. A long term (100 years) goal should be the focus. How to get there should be flexible. The most severe problems (fuels, roads, riparian degradation, habitat degradation, insects and disease) should be dealt with first.

8718 Com: Dear Sirs, I am a timber industry worker in Idaho and I very strongly believe in Multiple Use Management of our public lands. We need wise use of our natural resources and refrain from locking up the remainder of our lands for wilderness use only. We need to selective cut our diseased timber while at the same time be environmentally conscious. Jobs are more important than snails and weeds. Thank you.

8720 Q1) These questions are extremist and don't look to find a conservation perspective. They are incendiary in their form and presentation.

Q1a) We can't survive without as food and clothing sources.

Q6b1) (observing)

Q6c) Wildlife habitat destruction due to overgrazing and intensive logging practices.

Q11) The items marked as probable threats reflects my belief that given the delicate state of salmon populations in the Columbia River systems these threats are greater than they would be in a healthy system.

Q13) I believe that conservation must be the ethic and basis for resource management. Preservationist and wise use extremism are very dangerous to resources and land use. The USFS is being taken over by individuals without practical knowledge of wildlife conservation.

Q26) I believe these tow agencies are moving in the right direction at this time. My confidence in each of them is better than it was in the past. Multiple land use and conservation will ensure resources for the future.

8722 Q2) Industrial extremism has guided public and private land management with the current results: Fisheries teetering on extinction, forest products workers thrown-out of work from overcut timber base, highest rate of extinction ever seen on earth, degradation of water and air, and overall demise of life from which we all strive.

Q3) When dealing with the wealth of the environment we all need to live, dollar driven decision making is inappropriate, though comparison is appropriate.

8725 Q6c) Too many people with too little area.

Q11) Agriculture. Erosion/Non-point. Crop/Livestock in concentrating flow areas. Streambank erosion #1.

Q12) The Columbia/Snake watersheds have changed so much it may not be possible.

Q14) Conservation districts need more participation.

Q26) Motive and ability is not the issue. Politics/special interest groups! Seem to always carry the day!

8726 [Front cover) I am not afraid what others think of my opinions!

Q1e) Not equal rights - we were placed in the garden to care for and till it. Responsibility.

Q2) How you address these problems is the issue - answer is toward less regulatory and greater education.

Q3c) When possible to serve both goals.

Q3h) Depends - can you salvage the timber? Did the outbreak occur because the ecosystem was weakened by previous logging?

Q9d) Probably too idealistic - may people are greedy and selfish. I just dislike regulations because they inhibit me from making a correct personal choice. I am forced into an action or practice rather than arrive at the best option on my own. You must make a decision for a plan of action based on its own or unique circumstances. No blanket decisions -- This is what concerns me when you use such a large area for these EIS's.

Q11) Hatcheries --> Less viable genetic pool. Its the case of the straw that broke the camel's back. Its every little thing added up. Habitat Hydro Harvest Hatchery.

Q12) The truth or best option almost always lies somewhere between the extremes!

Q13a-n) Remember - State and federal agencies are made of people - good and bad mistakes and correct choices, good intentions and misguided ones - People - the same as the public. Each agency - indeed each person with in the agency must be judged on his or her own merits. Trust comes through communication and action that is consistent over time.

8728 Q2) The issue is not whether they exist, but what they are and how to address them.

Q14) Representatives of the pubic should make laws and the agencies should carry them out. Unfortunately, they often don't and the public bias to enter to uphold the law.

Q24) Identify rare elements of biodiversity and protect them, then identify where the greatest threats are to property and treat them, then begin to restore function to the roaded landscape. Lastly, think about what to do on the remaining landscape based on what you learned from earlier experiments.

Q23b) The idea is to reintroduce the process of fire not to "fix" what's broken. Fire will not kill disease and insects even significantly reduce fuel loads. It will change the fuel structure and the system's response to fire, bug, etc.

Q23g) There are plenty of places where "doing nothing" is exactly what is needed. It's not an either/or choice. It's a matter of determining where its appropriate to do what.

- 8731 Q1e) The human species evolved on the planet. If we degrade ecosystem we may inadvertently damage ourselves.
 Q2) Fire suppression and a growing human population have changed many western environments - insects, disease, and wildfire are acting to move these unstable situations back to more "normal" conditions.
 Q3b) Unused salmon habitat is available -dams must be modified before numbers will recover.
 Q2h) Conditions that encourage insect outbreaks should be changed.
 Q2i) Grazing should be allowed but not to the extent it is detrimental to other resources.
 Q6a) I work for the Forest Service.
 Q6c) Don't like crowds, traffic, tourists.
 Q9i) Selective harvesting does not mean individual tree selection (ie. uneven aged management) but selecting stands to be harvested?
 Q14) The public should decide broad issues but should not try to micro manage public land. That's why we hire professionals. The "public" however is not special interest groups. Finding out what the "real public" wants is the trick.
- 8732 Q23a) Depends on definition of "natural." I define as pre-European man.
 Q24a) To start the recovery process.
 Q24b) Through time as forests recover. (Sorry - won't fit your statistical analysis).
- 8733 Q6c) Flies, clear-cuts, stumps.
 Q24c) Conduct activities relative to resource management needs and resource production capabilities and mandate to see if the benefits of "rest" are a figment of the imagination.
- 8735 Q6c) Loss of ecological integrity as a result of grazing, logging, road construction.
 Q8) Public lands are managed and blanket policies regarding only one form of management blindly directs actions.
 Q14) The "public" does not know the ecological thresholds that are critical to maintaining viable communities. The public land managers have not quantified these relationships.
 Q24) The issue of management effect to biocycle is the first consideration, temporal and special influence is meaningless here.
- 8736 Q5) I am certain that there are some serious environmental problems and some that are defined as problems that are not.
 Q6c) People from metro who believe that everything was put on earth primarily for their use.
 Q7) The area you are concerned with is too vast for this question? Your choices

here need to be specific to the area.

Q8) If managed by man then for mankind; if by nature then this is a waste of time, if by the owl or the woodpecker or the salmon then let them save themselves.

Q9e) All areas are ecologically sensitive if constants are to be maintained. Close all roads!

Q14) Should be done by local government as delegated by the people who live closest to the results.

Q26) I believe both agencies have the ability to develop the aforementioned but I think they hear the loudest drum not the one that keeps the best beat.

8736 Q6c) Destruction of fish habitat by grazing and logging limited/eliminated fishing past logging practices destroyed scenery and opportunities for wildlife viewing.

Q23d) Why? Which trees?

Q24a) Do you mean timber harvest/grazing? If so SAY so.

Q24c) I do not understand what you mean by the bureaucratic term "management activities." And thus I cannot answer the question.

8737 Q1e) For good or ill, only humans have rights: The existence of the wild kingdom is subject to man's wisdom or lack of it.

Q8) Utilize prescribed burning as high priority management tool.

Q6a) We live adjacent to the BLM and USFS.

Q6c) Deschutes River has wall to wall river boats!

Q21) There is always a nice spot as good or better than what we have experienced in the past, out there where we have yet to travel.

Q24) My answer here is dependant on the tools you would use: since harvesting timber as a tool to mimic natural disturbances was suggested in Q-23, I would assume that is the tool for my answer #1. I feel timber harvest can be a good tool if planned will and by using Best Management Practices. However, even the best harvesting generally results in copaction and skid rows. I think it's best to get in - do the job - get out and let the land rest for 20-30 years. Some tools, such as prescribed burning could be done more often and dispersed over a period of time. You could also continue to plan wildlife habitat improvements such as water guzzlers or planting willows along creek beds over a long period of time and with many entries[?].

Q26) I have more trust in the ability and motives of the Forest Service because, by law, they are a multiple-use agency. The BLM does not have the same multiple use mandate and I feel they are more commodity driven. I think this is changing, and I have met some very competent BLM biologists. Also, there aren't many women or minorities in the BLM and they (the BLM people) often appear more unapproachable than the Forest Service people.

8740 Q1c) Protect but also use

Q2) Some exist but progress is being made - no use would be disastrous.
Q11k) These do not need to be a threat if managed properly.
Q23d) Not acceptable
Q26) Under present administration I have no trust in NFS or BLM. This does not reflect on local BLM and uses in the past, much trust was present.

8741 Q6c) Excessive grazing along trout streams.
Q8) We should suppress fires only when conditions warrant it. Salvage logging should be used for forest health.

8742 Q6c) Crowding, ATV use, jet boats, logging, grazing
Q8) We should carefully reintroduce fire as a management tool to improve forest health.

Q24) The approach should depend on scientific studies indicating the effects of management strategies on plants and wildlife.

Com: The philosophical questions in section Q-1 are strange, offensive, and entirely miss any meaningful point. Plants and animals don't exist for human use or not for human use. The reality for public policy debate is that humans choose to use them. I appreciate plants and animals if I'm using them or if I'm not using them. The important issue here is whether or not we choose to limit our use now to sustainable levels to allow for future generations' use of as many plants and animals as our generation has been blessed with. Similarly, whether or not humans are meant to rule over nature is not important in the public resource debate. The fact is that humans are smarter than anything else on this planet, so it's up to humans to choose how to manage (and when not to manage) the Earth's resources. We can "rule over nature" by using up all our resources as quickly as possible for the fastest profits, or "rule over nature" by using resources at sustainable levels to allow the same benefits for future generations. My choice would be the second. It is also not helpful to talk about whether wildlife and plants have any rights to live on the Earth. Even if plants and animals had absolutely no "right" to this Earth (which doesn't make much sense), I still believe humans have an obligation to their children to provide the benefits of plants and animals that we currently enjoy (and even to restore as much as possible of the productive capacity that we have destroyed). Question Q-2 asks for an opinion on the current level of environmental destruction in the West. This issue is a matter of scientifically-documented evidence from studies in a wide variety of fields. The unprecedented rate of plant and animal extinctions is not an opinion.

The most unbelievable offensive question is Q-3(g). This shows a complete lack of understanding of the problem. The problem is not whether nature is more important or man is more important, but how to have jobs to provide for today's families' opportunities and benefits. If demand for resources exceeds capacity for sustainable resource use, then hard choices have to be made to limit demand and shift workers

to jobs which are compatible with resource capacity. In the case of wood supply, this does not mean that timber workers wouldn't survive, they would just have to switch to jobs which are possible given the finite resource constraints. Why is there a question to choose the survival of timber families or the survival of Ancient Forests? Ancient forests should be around for the benefit of future generations, and we can help timber families find employment that doesn't destroy our valuable public resources. People are smarter than plants and animals and are capable of finding more options for survival. Question Q-12 is the same type of question; we are capable of finding solutions to the socioeconomic consequences of salmon recovery. We don't have to choose between people and salmon. Framing the questions in this way shows the lack of understanding which has led to the severe polarization of this issue, and has prevented people from moving toward workable solutions to these resource management problems.

8744 [From cover] I gave [?] [?] [?]. Reasonable attempt does not allow for accurate expression of my feelings on this extremely complex issues.

Q3h) No massive spray [?] but should be salvaged.

Q6c) Grazing

Q8) Allow for salvage

Q23a) Nobody knows how to do it at significant scale.

Q23e) Could let burn in wilderness

Q23f) No good control exists. Encourage salvage.

8746 Q1b)-Q1e) These questions are bogus. Depending on the answer, the respondent can be portrayed either as a radical environmentalist.

Com: I must take strong exception to your questions in Section 1. They are strongly biased and misleading without qualifying answers. One can see where they're leading. Who did this, anyway? So rather than answering 1-5, here are my answers. a. Plants and animals exist primarily for human use. Yes. Plants and animals were created by a loving Creator specifically for humans. b. Humankind was created to rule over the "rest of" nature. First, humankind is not part of nature. We were created in God's likeness. Second, we were created not to rule over, but to have dominion over. This implies specific requirements. c. "ethical obligation to protect" - Yes. While we have dominion, we must nurture creation since it has been entrusted in our care. However, that is as far as it goes. See "e". d. The earth should have far fewer people on it. Yes, but the imbalance has been caused by mankind's original separation from God. As created, there would have been no problems. Now we are living the consequences of our separation. If one answers yes to this question, then there are those who would immediately jump in and say, "The we have to limit population growth!" and then that leads to a pro-abortion policy as currently practiced by our federal government. This is totally wrong. I believe that the overpopulation of this

earth is a significant crisis that will not be solved. The only solution is to respond to God who says that "If my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves and pray, and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven and heal their land." Apart from God we have no hope. e. "Wildlife, plants, humans have equal rights..." - Not a chance! We must be compassionate. We must care for creation. But in no way, shape or form do wildlife and plants have equal status with humans. "Be a hero, save a whale. Save a baby go to jail." That rhyme pretty well sums up modern societies mixed up values! Do what if [?] love an animal, but try to save a human life, and society will put you in.

8748 Com: Management priorities and direction should be provided by nearby rural communities and resource professionals should carry them out.

8751 Q8e) We should use silvicultural practices followed by controlled burning; wildlife should be suppressed until fuel loading has been reduced to pre-European levels. Q24c) Utilize silvicultural practices to accomplish improved forest health, commodity outputs within an ecosystem management framework. This should be conducted on-going throughout the acreage.

Com: To Brent Steel et al. Comments on your survey: In my opinion, many of your questions do not frame a realistic range of alternatives and some of your alternatives are so diffused that it is difficult to really define what are asking. Examples: Q-1: You farmed two extreme and left out middle ground where most people would select. The questions that "the earth should have far fewer people on it," is ridiculous and unprofessional. Q-2: The term uncertain should not represent the mid-range? You are implying that people are either polarized or confused? Q-3: Is good. Q-5: Same as Q-2. Q-6c: You only allowed for neutral-negative in your range. Perhaps someone viewed a management practices that they supported. Q-7: Good. Q-8: Very bad in terms of range of alternatives; you should have included prescribed fire in alternatives where it would be used in conjunction with other management practices. Q-23: You should have included more meaningful options. Most people understand that; for example, firewood gathering, at best, can only play a very minor role! Q-24: So ambiguous the reader could infer any scenario he/she chooses. Hopefully most responses relied on "other." In conclusion, I would strongly urge you to re-structure your questions and try again. I feel the results of this survey will not represent the views of the participants. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to give my comments.

8755 Q3g) I don't think "survival" of timber workers and families is really an issue. This question sounds like industry rhetoric. On the other hand, survival of old growth forest (not just big trees) is a very real issue. Thanks.
Q6c) 1. Distressing stream and hillside erosion. 2. Sometimes overwhelming odor of

- cow manure. 3. Extensive non-native plant species (eg. cheat grass, medussa head).
- 8756 Q6c) Cattle in riparian camping areas, defecating in streams, deruding brush.
Q8) Set predetermined acreage by zone to allow natural fire to burn. Most big fires burn out by themselves, anyway, and money is wasted fighting them. Utilize prescribed fire, also.
Q23a) With great restraint.
Q23c) Disallow commercial woodcutting.
Q23d) In certain areas this needs to happen.
Q23e) We don't understand the long-effects of management techniques.
Q24c) Maintain large blocks of connected old-growth, some on commercial land utilize management techniques to create complex mosaic of edge, disturbances, and long rotations.
- 8757 Q6c) Grazing and logging ruin the aesthetics of natural forest experience. Extensive damage to ecosystem.
Q24b) Uneven age management of timber, long rotations, management for biodiversity, exclusion of livestock from riparian habitat, protect existing old growth and roadless areas.
- 8758 Q7) Private property rights.
Q24) 20 to 40 thousand acres is too much area for either approach. Some tracts might need little management and others need intense management you really need to look at it piece by piece and manage instead of prescribing a blanket approach to the whole thing.
- 8759 Q6c) Grazing - dead cow at inlet to lake and cow pies everywhere making finding a campsite difficult.
Q9i) It might be OK but I don't trust the Forest Service. What they call selective harvest, I call a two step clear-cut.
- 8760 Q14) Land management officials should do their job and be held accountable. John Q. Public does not have the training to make decisions.
Q24) Ensure a sustained yield through forest management practices that will stabilize our economies and insure biodiversity through managed forest succession providing appropriate habitats for humans as well as flora and fauna.
- 8763 This full of "loaded" questions. Your continually [?] there are "major" problems when the don't exist or are minor in nature.
Q3h) Who do we have brains?
Q8) Trees are a renewable resource and should be harvested, not burned.

- Q9) You are suggesting we have problems? This is a loaded question.
 Q12) Get rid of foreign trawlers and El Nino and the salmon will come back.
 Q13i) Depends on where they're from and who they are.
 Q14) 4 and 5 on a local level.
- 8764 Q6c) Crowding, grazing.
- 8765 Q6c) All of the above, depending on where I was - I also can still find some fairly pristine places.
 Q24) The salmon are at a crisis state - the dams are the major problem and need to be either removed or remodeled to allow safe passage ASAP!
- 8766 Q6c) Excessive roading/access cattle in places they shouldn't be. Number of people. Past timber harvest.
 Q24) Can't say based on above.
- 8767 Q6c) All of the above have interfered at one time or another.
- 8768 Q8e) Suppress man-made fires - not natural fire.
- 8769 Both federal agencies have the professional ability but in most cases, they can't perform in a professional manner because of all the laws and regulations they are governed by (NEPA, etc.) (Includes non professional public input).
- 8771 Q2) Poorly worded choices.
 Q23) Do you mean in 100,000 acre clearcuts?
- 8775 Q3) g. "Survival is an inappropriate term. Timber workers who have been forced to leave the industry in my area have "survived" by taking other jobs in housing construction, well-drilling, etc.
 Q6c) Crowding, noise, logging.
 Q14) #4 but also have scientist (university researchers) as equal partners with "resource professionals (USFS, BLM)
 Q23a) Only in currently managed, not specific areas.
 Q23c) Depends on sensitivity of area.
 Q23d) Unless for wildlife trees where existing snags are deficient.
 Q24c) #2 but longer periods of rest between entries, slow management down; don't try to manipulate natural cycles to our economic and life cycles -- do the reverse.
- 8777 Q26) Good management practices likely to be superseded by political motivations.

- 8780 Q6c) Trying to dodge cattle droppings.
Q19) I find this question offensive.
Q24) Each watershed has to be judged on its own set of problems - I don't like either of the options suggested above - Why not consider no entry in watersheds that have been trashed - Mill Creek in Pend Orielle County for instance.
Q26) I have little trust in the management people in the F.S. I have more trust in the working people on the ground .
- 8781 Q1e) My neutral (3) responses are because of the way questions are phrased not uncertainty.
Q2) There is always room for improvement as well as more knowledge regarding our environment.
Q3b) Screen dam turbines and irrigation pumps.
Q3c) ESA has no 'bottom line'
Q3e) Wilderness doesn't equate to "preserved" sort of 'control' as in lab experiment.
Q3g) Old growth is over-rated for bio-diversity - becomes less so as the canopy closes.
Q3i) Balanced multiple use - no one use should rule except in certain mgmt prescriptions for range health.
Q8) Fuel loading is so critical not that we need reduce it before using fire as a tool for forest health.
Q9) Whichever is best for individual area.
Q26b) Politically ruled by an ill-informed administration run by poorly informed public.
- 8785 Q24b) This sound inefficient. NIMBY!
Q23c) This seems like a silly choice. The impacts and effectiveness will obviously be different.
- 8787 Q1c) This question is ambiguous. I'm changing and adapting so should the plants and other animals.
Q14) The people should have power, but the people don't necessarily know.
- 8789 Q6c) I go in the off season.
Q24) Not sure which mimic natural processes best.
- 8792 Q8) There are months when suppression is needed but fire is a tool we should use to protect and manage forests.
- 8795 Q3g) Timber workers will not die if they can't cut old growth.
Q3h) Forests and rangelands should be managed to prevent outbreaks in the first

place.

Q6c) Cow droppings and locked gates on public lands.

Q11b) El Nino cycles and salmon co-existed for eons.

Q11e) Failure of Corps of Engineers to follow law.

Com: The journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition and other historical accounts document the potential of a free-flowing Columbia River System (and its natural, unmanaged watershed) to provide habitat for one of the planet's greatest fisheries. While it is impractical to expect a return to pristine conditions in the Columbia River Basin, is it wise to perpetuate fooling management decisions made during the Great Depression only to maximize private profit at public expense? First, requiring the Corps of Engineers to install or improve fishways to permit upstream fish migration and to install and maintain screens on intakes for hydro-power or irrigation diversions would go a long way to restoring many native salmon runs. Second, as the population of the Columbia Basin and coastal Northwest grows, there will increasing demands for hydro-power. The subsidized power now provided to the aluminum industry is a welfare program for the benefit of private industry at public expense. The demise of this uncompetitive industry would cast a few thousand jobs, but tens of thousands of jobs depend on the recovery of the commercial and recreational salmon fishery in the Northwest. Illegal dewatering of streams by practices such as water spreading clearly have no place in a Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan. Stream sedimentation resulting from timber harvest activities makes recovery of salmon stocks difficult if not impossible--these practices should be stopped. Finally, a host of fish and wildlife species would benefit from healthy riparian ecosystems along Columbia River Basin rivers and streams. Riparian ecosystems will not recover as long as the BLM looks the other way and allows overgrazing to degrade riparian and rangelands under its jurisdiction.

8798 Q2) Expect fire from poor management!

Q6c) I could see diseased trees in the forest and spreading.

Q24) Let the private sector decide what is best for the economy and ecology of the lands. The people own the lands, not the government!

8800 Q6c) Grazing! Cow Pies!!

8801 Q6c) Visual impairment due to logging.

Q8) If human activity is only in 'appropriate' places.

Q24) Since the conditions reached are due to a lack of consistent activity - perhaps a little bit at a time to fix issues gradually but with sustainability.

Q26) Due to politics, not the people working.

8802 Q24) I like the answers to 1 and 2 but I believe in multiple use of our forests. I feel

the timber industry-recreational use can still be accomplished on a year round basis with sound management practices.

Q25) I don't want to see anything go up in smoke.

- 8803 Q9) Depends on type of regulation and recreation.
Q24) Logging and management activities and sites differ too much for any single approach. Faster healing sites may take heavier more prolonged activity than fragile sites.
- 8807 Q3) Enforcement of the Multiple Use Act (1960) must be improved.
Q6c) Limitations on fishing due to Columbia River salmon restrictions.
Q11l) Lack of enforcement of some current laws.
Q14) Let policy be established by scientists and engineers.
Q26) Politics just doesn't let these agencies do their jobs. All decisions/politics should be made by scientists/engineers. The general public is ignorant - their input should be limited.
- 8809 Q6c) Logging-roads tore up. Hard to wait to go through. Trucks drove by fast and recklessly. Dustiness.
Q8) We need to first clean out excess undergrowth and then allow fire to keep the forest clean and healthy.
- 8810 Q24) There are many ecosystems to be managed, they must be managed to their betterment, no matter what tools you use - monitor them and modify your management to achieve the ecosystem betterment.
Q26) I fear that they might be pressured to give into the few radicals that are making all the noise and not the majority.
- 8811 Q26) Wrong question! How much trust is there in Congress not to interfere with decisions based on science? None!
- 8812 Q14) Current input process for public should be strengthened.
Q24) Do not trust federal agencies to illegally do either 1 or 2.
- 8813 Q6c) Waste of diverted stream flows. Extensive clearcut. Too many people.
- 8814 Q20) Why isn't mining included?
- 8820 Q8) Timber harvest should be used where ever needed to ensure proper stocking.
Q23) If you choose this, we don't need any resources managers!
Com: To: Brent Steel, Stephanie Witt, Bruce Shindler. After reading this

questionnaire, I am more convinced than ever that all federal lands ought to be managed by county government. Local control is the only way do ensure rural communities have an opportunity to safeguard their economic well-being.

8821 [Front cover] Your questionnaire does not [?] how people will meet their needs if federal lands do not do their share who will? Preserving federal lands and secluding fire will cause the forest to move out of the range of natural conditions encouraging large stand replacement fires that can't be controlled threatening people, homes and families.

Q2) But reason is fire seclusion and a lack of stocking control on federal lands logging was designed and controlled by the federal government.

Q9) I would need to know more specifics to take a stronger position all these options may make sense n specifics applications.

Q24) Bring the forests to within the range of natural conditions with harvesting and prescribed fire and keep them slightly understocked and as they become overstocked reenter the stands.

Q26) USFS, USMFS, U.S. Congress. These people have put the BLM and USFS in almost impossible position.

8822 Q6c) Clear cuts marred the view, cow pies had to be cleared for a tent site and the vegetation had been grazed to bare dirt, motorcycles also created noise.

Q8) Private property should not be protected at taxpayer expense unless the agency has increased fire danger as a result of management activities.

Q9e) Timber harvest usually requires roads. I oppose all timber harvest if new roads must be created. Light selective cuts may be acceptable if no new roads are created.

Q11) Predators - Only a problem because of the decreased populations. Native Americans - Only a problem because of decreased populations. Commercial fishing -

Only a problem if unregulated. Needs heavy regulation while fish populations are low.

Q13) Decision makers all seem to be driven by politics, money, and greed. There may be no hope. Not all, but most universities seem to have sold out to the industries that support them. The American public is not well informed on the issues or doesn't want to know. Few people or agencies give the land a high priority and until that happens, there is no one qualified to manage it. A few well informed environmentalists are our only hope and their access and influence on agencies and decisions must be maintained or even increased.

Q20) I am a hunter-gatherer and live off the land on \$2,500 a year.

Q21) I like the location, not the people.

8825 Q2) Due to mismanagement practices. 1. Not spraying for insect infestation, 2. Not harvesting damaged trees, 3. Not allowing grazing to keep brush down and allowing

- feed to grow for wildlife.
- Q3c) But also for benefit of these using the products harvested. Better production management.
- Q3g) One is not more important than the other; however selective harvesting could be done effectively.
- Q3i) Should be managed for livestock, wildlife, etc. Equally.
- Q9d) Not good unless other practices are changed.
- Q11f) Regarding value of dams?
- Q23) I cannot rank these tools as they are all poor choices in my opinion. Where are tools like spraying, selective cutting, re-planting cloned varieties, and grazing to keep down brush and forest floor fuel?
- 8827 Q1d) What are going to do? Exterminate like Hitler?
Q2) It is better now than 40 years ago.
- 8828 Q26) I rate these this way if there is no interference from politics.
- 8829 Q8) Implement indigenous, pre-Columbian burning practices.
Q6c) Too many damn roads, jet boats.
Q24) End "man"augment as we know it. End commercial uses of public land.
- 8831 Q24) Use rotating bases, but with med periods of rest.
- 8834 Q24) Basically #2 with a coherent monitoring plan. There must be a way of determining outcome.
- 8835 Q8) Duplicate natural cycles, size at any one time.
Q6c) Dams poor design for fish.
Q24) Duplicate natural cycles and conditions only!!!
- 8839 Q2) This question is difficult to answer because "uncertain" is where "intermediate" should be.
- 8840 Q1c) Interest - yes.
Q3f) May agree more if "rare" defined e.g. why are they rare.
Q3g) Ans. assumes this means "survival of lifestyle" rather than life or death.
Q8c) Assuming a lot our understanding about forest health and what promotes it!
Q11c) But could affect range.
Q11k) Easiest "affect" to manage.
Q23) Obviously -- I have no strong feelings due to lack of info.
Q26) Operative word is ability. Both have ample expertise and resources. They need

leadership.

- 8841 Q8) We should allow fire to resume its natural role.
Q11) Over population.
Q6c) Too much development; too much logging and grazing; not enough fish and wildlife.
Q24c) Try some of each, then pick most effective (ie. best for nature) through adaptive management approach.

- 8844 Q1e) The rest of the above statements are ridiculous.
Q2) Serious environmental problems exist everywhere - another rigid statement.
Q3) Here again - many of these statements are meaningful only to zealots on both sides.
Q12) Another bad question.
Q23) I find this similar to "when did you stop beating your wife?"
Q24) Stop using computer generated possibilities and try a bit at a time to see what really works.

Com: As a third generation born Oregonian with two more generations following on the family ranch, I feel that I can speak with a good deal of experience with our region. I do not wish to seem like an old fud, but the questions on study require answers that do not necessarily reflect at least my opinions. Some of the statements in the supplemental survey seem to be designed to run into computer programs and this is scary : Remember the Vietnam experience of the "light at the end of the tunnel?" It is probable that we cannot solve all the problems, and there are problems, with "either or" solutions. Many of our region's problems are the result of the extended drought and the burgeoning population. The only solution to those are a return of the Japanese Current and stringent birth control: I am afraid we can't stop that. Don't be discouraged and don't quit trying, but let us try the medicines a bit at a time. There is no Panacea.

- 8848 Q6c) People
Q8e) Too difficult to answer, entire system seems too out of balance. Fires are now too devastating.

- 8849 Q11) Reagan budget cuts in the 80s.

- 8850 Q6c) Trespass cattle in wilderness.
Q8c) "Let burn" policy in wilderness, if natural causes, that is.
Q11) Other natural predators other than seals.
Q23a) However, limit clearcut size to 20-25 acres.
Q23d) If for [?] meters[?], perches and other wildlife purposes.

Q23f) In managed forests, yes.

8851 Q22) Resource use membership - yes.

Q23a) Clearcutting?

Q23) My #1 choice is uneven age multiple species management.

8853 Q24) Number 2 is much closer than number 1.

Com: Answers to the questions as presented cannot be expected to reflect thoughtful opinion. Q-1) Part C - this isolates the issue from our interdependence on there life forms. Q-2) Part d, I think that , with continuous care of the earth, the present population could be sustained with modest comfort. We have too many people for an abused and neglected earth. As for a philosophy -humans should be capable of thinking and caring. The role of humans i the forest should be to provide careful and thoughtful MANUAL labor. Q-2) Marked 7. an understatement. Q-3) Part d - object to the word 'protection.' If we do things right, the habitat would be satisfactory. Q-3) part e, depends on suitability of proposed tracts. Q-8) Some of use are reluctant to reject management opinions and so cannot choose from statements. Fire cannot be natural: the ignition can be. Fire will burn in accordance with human influenced conditions. As popularly proposed, the use of fire is disastrous. This whole issue rejects the impacts on the soil. If humans were willing to wait 300 to 400 years between major disturbances and all and only the components and life process of natural systems were maintained within relatively short distances, it might work. We must manage our forests with restrained thinning and returning of dead woody material to the soil as our basic forest practices. Without that, all of this planning is certain to fail. Q-9, parts a and c and i - The adjective 'restrained' should be added. Q-11 parts d and e - we should do our best to take care of upstream habitat, and keep pointing at downstream factors. Q-113) The issue of trust and motivation can be misconstrued. If I wee putting together an organization, there would be a place for many agency people, but probably not silviculturists and planners. People in organizations tend to do what the whole team is comfortable with. A few, who have received agency training only, can preclude change. My trust of an agency as such is zero. Q-14) The land managers must be absolutely responsible, but they should, humbly, accept all of the help that they can get and differentiate between politics and reason. Q23) To Hell with mimicking natural disturbances: manage with what is present recognizing succession not the disturbance. Firewood gathering is a way to reduce down wood and get more flat to the ground to decompose more readily. don't just allow firewood gathering, but encourage and manage it. Girdling trees to create wildlife snags where needed and to encourage aspen regeneration is fine, but have a purpose for the practice. We need management as far as insects and disease are concerned, starting with proper spacing and encouraging decomposition of organic material. Severe disturbances and

reduction of soil moisture retention and nutrient facts will result in trees having less vigor to resist. Maintaining natural predators should be the second step of control. Q24) Don't use 'intensive management' as an euphemism for rape. Low impact forestry may be a result of advanced management. Think in terms of impacts not number of entries. Don't think of low impacts on a rotating basis, but rather doing what is necessary and timely. Q25) There are many more reasons to be opposed to prescribed burning, including the grim history of fires getting away. Q26) There won't be scientific consensus. Members of the Eastside Strategies team will grow tired and finally accept that which they cannot agree with. Only a few will be pleased with the results.

8854 Q6c) Crowding, lack of campsites.

Q11i) 1872 Mining Laws.

Q24) Keep units of selected management activities small to create a "mosaic" effect. No activity except closing roads and putting to bed in "key" watersheds, important to fish, wildlife, or water quality.

8857 Q24) Neither 1 or 2 will be correct for all cases. It will depend on the current status of the watershed and implement future events such as wildfire, disease, drought.

8858 Q2) Environment problems exist, but may be corrected with proper management.

Q3i) Livestock grazing would be included with other uses.

8859 [Front cover] Please do not use the term rangelands (=cows) for public lands with non-tree vegetation. Obviously these questions are simplistic as are the responses, all of which should be qualified according to context in which problems are existing. The long-term viability of natural systems are given little attention. This project (survey) is sponsored by the agencies causing the destruction and popular opinion is inadequate to resolving scientific or philosophical questions.

Q6c) Logging, cattle, roads.

Q24) Abandon the view that the public forests are fiber factories and avoid managing." Permit only incidental selective logging with horses or small machines. Protect all life forms for biodiversity preservation.

Q26) E.E.M.P. is corrupted also by the inclusion of voodoo social "scientists." These people should have no influence on a "scientifically" sound range.

8861 Q6c) Gunshots, ORV damage

Q8) In developing areas, fire should be a management tool to improve forest health and reduce wildfire risk; in underdeveloped areas, fire should be allowed to resume a more natural role, but Rx fire should also be used where needed to improve health and reduce fuels.

- Q9c) Depends on types and degrees of sensitivity and recreational use.
 Q11l) Barging
 Q11) m. hatchery strains.
 Q23a) Within a reasonable range.
 Q23c) With restrictions in sensitive areas.
 Q23d) Limited application
 Q23) Management areas need to be prioritized depending on health risk, environmental sensitivity, uniqueness, etc.
- 8862 Q8e) We should use both vegetative manipulation, [?] as timber harvest, and controlled fire in a [?] way to achieve ecologically sustainable forests.
- 8863 Q3g) Polarized question. Very bad question.
 Q6c) Bad question.
 Q14) 3 but still comply with NEPA and agency laws.
 Q24) Wait till land and support (1) then implement watersheds below ecological carrying capacity now.
- 8864 Q6c) Prefer wilderness setting and characteristics for my recreation activities - even there livestock grazing impacts are unavoidable.
 Q23d) Not the best method to create snags.
 Q23f) including ecosystem health.
 Q23g) including ecosystem health.
- 8865 Q1e) I don't dwell on such anthropomorphic concepts. an intellectually bankrupt concept.
 Q2) Question doesn't relate to issue raised relative to management practices.
 Q8) Fire is a tool and should only be used when appropriate. Fire events are fact specific and we must use caution not to over generalize.
 Q9h) If you are referring to organic as in chemistry or organic in nature, in either case question is poorly stated.
 Q11l) a. General climatic conditions on-shore. b. Interspecies predation. c. Intraspecies predation. d. Hatchery releases. e. Human conflicts including recreational activities.
 Q3d) Question assumes that habitat is not now sufficient.
 Q3i) Your question are designed to achieve desired answers and not truly designed to ascertain public opinion on these issues. You continue on the labeling/type casting errors prevalent in forest service planning.
 Q5) Poorly phrased question since does not address prior statements. Doesn't allow for neutral position.
 Q12) Question does not address statement. This question is designed to elicit

responses that support a predetermined statement.

Q13) This is a poor question relative to federal agencies. The question is to what degree all of the public should be heard and whether on an equal basis.

Q23) This is a question very easy to misapply. The answer can be used to support any conclusion one wants to derive.

8866 Q14) NEPA and the EIS process is on a solid foundation as a mean in determine the public role.

8869 Q111) Returning sick fish from Hatchery to SGA.

Com: HOW MUCH TRUST DO YOU HAVE IN THE FOLLOWING. EEMP (1). MR. STEEL (1). MR WITT (1). MR SHINDLER (1). (1) = No trust at all. TODAY: 7/29/94 As of noon we have burned 130,000 acres of Washington State; over 2 million acres in the West. The above have not submitted questions that lead to Forest Management that protects the Public Lands - Forests - Wildlife - Plants - Humans- environment - Habitat - Soil Erosion - Salmon - Threatened species - Recreation - Sports - Etc. In this day and age we have tools other than fire, which is the only rational, affordable, environmental control tool other than isolating areas from public use presented in this questionnaire. The 2 million acres of public land that is burned annually is not management for the public benefit. Some of the tools we have today are access - roads, ridge roads, fire breaks, clear cuts that grid the forest on natural boundaries to control and limit the burns and give the capability to burn infected areas and excessive fuel levels. The Canadians hire sheep bands to clear under growth on government lands to keep grass lands open, the wild animals do not do this. The EEMP will destroy all bands of sheep and many cattle herds in the next ten years and lose a land management tool that can be used without cost to the government. Astute questions could bring this out on a non-biased questionnaire. If the questionnaires were to go to the effected counties for questions they could identify what works and what does not. The area you are talking about, the Columbia River Basin, is made up of Counties and People in those Counties whose culture, custom, work, and economics can be destroyed by following the limited number of alternatives offered in your questionnaire. To be effective this plan must have the support of the people involved. The Counties must have a more significant voice in the EEMP plan and the right of refusal where the local culture or custom is in jeopardy. Without their support no plan will be effective.

8870 Q6a) I travel to the CRB for business.

Q8) Add controlled fire to #4.

Q24) Prioritized management activities based upon their ability to stabilize and reverse biodiversity losses and ecosystem destruction. Perform highest-priority management activities at landscape level in order to halt current decline of forest

ecosystems. Then perform restoration activities at sites that offer best habitat for salmonids, fur-bearers and other at-risk species. Any strike-force of management activities in large watershed could potentially compact soils and thus lead to further degradation of the fertility of Eastside forests. "Light-touch" management will be a significant challenge to Eastside forest managers.

8871 Q6c) Grazing damage

Q8) Weigh benefits to ecosystem and act accordingly.

Q11) Allowing scientific decisions by non-scientists.

Q24) Mimic natural rate and process where possible. Curtail all unnecessary entry by machines. Encourage 'light touch' with all management activities.

8872 Q12) Only if the plan is based on natural recovery and conditions (no bargaining, for instance).

Q23a) [disturbances] what does this mean.

Q23b) Dead and down only.

8873 Q23f) Let's manage the natural resources.

8874 Q3g) New opportunities should be created for timber workers.

Q6c) Timber harvest, motorized activity.

Q11) Get rid of the dams!

Q24) Sequential. Use prescribed burns to reduce fuel loads then allow natural regimes to return.

8875 Q8) Use fire in wilderness to maintain forest health.

Com: Section 1, Q 1. A series of poor questions. The relationships between humans the animal and plant species can exist in harmony,. Questions are aimed towards the decision, is man more important than nature, a ridiculous judgment to make. Section 2, Q 2. I believe the condition of public lands in the Intermountain area is deteriorating because of lack of vegetative management applications. There are serious environmental problems, but are due to a lack of management rather than current management practices. Section 3, Q 5. See above discussion. Deterioration is caused by a lack of management rather than poor practices.

8876 Q6c) Primitive, limited choices of camp sites, grazing.

Q8) Same as 4 but add - also "suppress catastrophic summer fires and allow cooler late season wildfires to burn until more (more=60-80% or as recommended by fire ecologists) of the landscape has had a "recent" burn of moderate intensity over it.

Q9i) Different from past "selective harvesting."

Q11c) Should not be a threat unless populations have already declined.

- Q25) With good PR - ads in paper, etc.
- Q26) The product will be the proof - until then it's wait and see.
- 8877 Q1a) Co-exist; arrogant to think otherwise.
- Q6c) Crowding, grazing, logging, inconsiderate/sloppy people.
- Q8) Question: \$16 million (so far) spent on fighting Wa. state fires --how far would that go to help families relocate or reimburse for wages lost?
- Q9i) Not sure. Would it. What guarantee.
- Q11c) Limited
- Q23) Insufficient information to adequately respond. Tools for what?? etc. All but impossible to rank these; each applies to a different outcome. "Management tools" for what???
- Q23b) Necessary to healthy forest...Jury still out on this issue (in my mind).
- Q23d) For "wildlife trees?" Need better reason to do this.
- Q23e) [land management] needs better definition.
- Q23f) [land management values] needs better definition.
- Q24) Is this a "either/or" situation? Both approaches could be valid in more or better identified areas. At the size indicated, I would have to "choose" #1 but on the other hand...
- Q25) Recreation can be put on hold. Inconvenient to some, but not a health risk.
- Q26) Tempered at local level by lack of funding to implement a system...At a local level; national "top-of-the-pyramid" level needs to establish better trust.
- 8878 Q7) Rising income tax for federal services.
- Com: Q-7 #18: Section 3. I favor the wise use of Natural Resources on public lands, not locking them up and paying higher income tax to make up for the loss of federal revenues from these resources. Such as timber, grazing and Hydro-electric power. Q#26 Supplemental Columbia River Basin Survey. It's not so much a matter of trusting these agencies' motives as it is to the inference by environmental groups' lawsuits and court decisions including the administrative directives and congressional inference. How can we curb this and let the agencies carry out the plan and guide lines for the Columbia Basin.
- 8881 Q3c) The endangered species act should be modified but not for only timber and ranching, also for common sense decisions.
- Q6b7) Leaving stress behind is the important reason for recreating. The current political climate of savers against users makes this more difficult to achieve.
- Q13m) The people living in resource areas tend to have a high degree of "pride of ownership" and have a sound knowledge of direction to the future for resource and social issues.
- Q26) Both BLM and USFS have the ability to achieve positive results in any

undertaking. However with the present political climate both have become agencies of planners not doers. A high degree of mistrust from all sides is being directed at both. Both were able to do much more before their hands became tied. A decision based on best information of fact no longer exists. Loss of citizen rights from all causes has become the topic of conversation.

- 8882 Q8) Fire should be used to eliminate logging / thinning slash too much down woody debris is being left causing natural fires to destroy valuable animal habitat and timber.
Q24) To correctly manage a watershed requires constant care - the logging practice of the past - in concentrating only on large green timber sales. No active salvage timber sales and management since 1979 - no active thinning or slash burning has created the mess where in with the insect infestation.
- 8884 Q9b) Clearcutting does provide plant and wildlife diversity.
Com: Q14) Vocal minority - Silent majority. Some special interest groups know how to push the right buttons.
Q23) With world population pressure we must not shift harvest of natural renewable resources to other and countries and regions. The world and especially American cannot manage millions of acres of ecosystems as preserves. We have responsibility to provide renewable resources (timber, power, geothermal, grazing) as well as mineral resources. We also have a responsibility to provide for wildlife and plants. The key is to determine the right balance.
Q26) I believe many in the BLM and FS enter their personal preferences into the planning and decision-making. I believe many people are politically sensitive. I do believe these "professionals" can do a professional, balanced stewardship management plan and application in the CRB.
- 8888 Q6c) Trails destroyed - streams silted
Q14) If suggestions are given full consideration.
Q24) The CRB is too diverse to treat in broad general prescriptions. Management should reflect specific situations.
- 8889 Q2) Vague questions - Is the serious environmental problem because of man's intervention or lack of intervention? I think the latter.
Q8) Answer should combine 2 and 3.
Com: Q2) As I stated in questionnaire, your question is vague as one can give a response either way depending on why there is an environmental problem. I feel this is a serious problem in the CRB due to lack of man's management in the forested areas. Q5) Same as above.
Q8) The response should combine #2 and #3. Suppress fire in federal forests managed for timber; use pesticides or salvage logging if forests health is endangered;

and use controlled fire to protect forest health. Fire, pesticides, herbicides, salvage logging are all tools to manage the forest. General: On the Eastside of the Cascade clear cutting has its place but it has been used too extensively. I think both private and public land managers know this, coupled with public opinion, and are using selective logging more often. I support clear cuts if the stand warrants it, but prefer select cuts, uneven aged management more.

- 8890 Q2) There has also been a lot of talk by these who have observed public lands for many years about the improving trend from dismal conditions. Problems remain but the trend is in the right direction.
Q11) Shutting down activities on public lands and forcing more intensive use of private lands.
Q31) Livestock grazing is receiving much less emphasis over other uses than it used to receive. Livestock grazing should receive at least equal emphasis with other uses. It is compatible with most other uses under most circumstances.
Q5) In many cases they are improving. Rangelands are an example. This survey seems biased toward forest issues.
Q6c) Too many people have discovered the area (i.e. crowding, noise).
Q13) University research scientists are impossible to fit into one category. I have a great deal of trust in some, absolutely no trust in some and varying degrees of trust in the balance depending on how well informed each is and whether or not an agenda is being advocated. Federal courts, likewise. Public opinion is generally not well informed and is often based on propaganda by advocacy groups.
Q23) This is definitely skewed to forest issues as opposed to rangeland issues.
- 8891 Q6c) Grazing impacts to riparian areas; past logging done poorly; noisy machines on lakes and back country.
Q9b) Only in lodgepole and in very small acres.
Q9d) If existing laws were enforced, we'd likely not need new ones. Please count my vote and no new roads for timber sales.
Q9i) If no new roads.
Q11c) Very localized
Q11j) It's shut down.
Q11f) #1 Reason. Fix the damn dams.
Q14) Biologists - other specialists should provide data and biology and ecology should derive decisions. Most politicians or extractive abusers of public land.
Q23a) This would mean, no new roads as nature does not have roads. I would support harvest without new roads.
Q24) I'm not sure of #1 or #2 - would seem the choice has to be made case by case.
Q26) This varies according to ranger district, forest or BLM district. Politics dictate, not biology.

- 8892 Q14) Let the people who use the land decide they don't want to ruin their way of life.
- 8893 Q14) States within have involvement not beyond nonprofit organizations public not taxpayers not equal, in decisions. They don't pay the bills.
- 8894 Q14) Comply with existing statutes and exercise stewardship mission if based on ecological truths.
- 8895 Q3g) Old growth forests can be maintained in wildernesses, monuments and existing dedicated areas as well as in the general forest area, by increasing the rotation age to 200 or 250 years.
Q6c) On weekends and holidays during the winter time, there is moderate to heavy use by snowmobiles and RVs. They make loud noise that distract from the cross country skiing experience and chop up areas that are close in the take-off points.
Q22) I lean heavily towards the Gifford Pinchot concept of wise use (multiple use) of resources.
Q23) Use good management technique to effect wise use of resources.
Q26) There are ambiguous questions which seem to assume that the agencies have full unfettered control. They have not and do not; the vocal public through the President and Congress have set the pace for at least the USFS during the past 50 years.
- 8897 Q8) I don't have faith in the USFS and controlled burns -Too many have gotten out of control.
Q11) increased population.
Q23) Actually I'm not in favor of any of these practices.
Com: To whom it may concern; Thank you for this opportunity to make comments. The public has lost faith in the Federal Agencies ability to manage Public Lands. The court system is making poor decisions based on insufficient information,. Legislators are playing politics and trading favors, not making decisions based on sound facts or trying to get the real facts. Too many well meaning groups are trying to make recommendations based on what they think is good for the citizens. They are not communicating with the users of the lands, but trying to document their decisions from books. Experience is the best teacher! Its time for those groups of people and the users come together and help each other decide what is best. Find a agency whose willing to listen and work with the groups and keep the court system out of the process.
- 8900 Q6c) at times there are too many people (weekends, holidays) but not as bad on other days. We expect to see laws, some logging which is part of the use of public

lands.

Q9) b and c. Depends on stand conditions, species, etc.

Q14) Resource professionals must be given authority to do the job.

Q26) Agencies have ability but respond too much to vague political winds.

8902 Q3g) This question is biased and misinformed. Timber jobs will not be saved by cutting the remaining old growth. Preservation of old growth is not these peoples' problem. This statement would better read: "timber workers jobs are dependent upon the preservation of O.G. to see public perception.

Q6c) I constantly see the negative impacts that over crowding is having on our forests - litter, trail compaction[?], overflowing campgrounds... When cross-country skiing in the winter I am bothered by snowmobile noise and pollution. Logging and grazing degrade the land, this upsets me greatly.

Q7a) Quality is subjective - it could apply to any of these other values...

Q9d) This should be stated by cutting down fuel loads, then controlled fire. The chances of fires becoming catastrophic is diminished.

Q9a) Not as timber sales.

Q9) Selective [?] underburnings to thin out unders[?].

Q11) Add this point just about everything is a threat because they are so depleted. It is a matter of what has caused the problem and what the system (fish) can still take.

Q14) The public and the resource people should respond to the best science that addresses ecosystem needs.

Q23) Not as long as clearcutting is still an option in HRV's.

8904 Q24) Varies by site.

8905 Q3i) If we maintain a healthy forest by management and make good local decisions on land management we would have forest industry jobs, grazing, old growth and recreations. This must be done by land management on the ground and not in the courts or political arena.

Q5) The new riparian laws are causing stream corridors to be logged heavily on private land - log it or lose it! This law is case of political management that has created a problem.

Q7) The present preservationist ideas equate to no management - under this management we are losing our forest to insects and fire - nothing is being managed.

Q9b) (Where needed) I don't like clearcuts by they are a tool that may need to be used.

Q9c) A good land manager should have authority to make these decisions - not the courts or political pressure.

Q9d) Need good management - not more regulations.

Q9f) Local control and freedom from regulation for management to make decisions on more grazing or less grazing on a yearly basis.

Q11d and e) I have not seen this destruction - until the new riparian law was announced to take effect Sept., 1994!.

Q11) All the items circled above are known to kill fish.

Q24) Get the management of our forests out of the courts and political area and let land managers do their job!

Q26) Govt. agencies and scientific community has a poor track record on proper decision-making.

8906 Q1d) Dumb question

Q3i) Should incorporate not emphasize. Leading and poorly worded question.

Q5) Poorly worded question.

Q23a) I want to see if natural disturbances also means catastrophic occurrences.

Q23d) This should be a crime.

Q23e) This will mean most fires must be controlled.

Q23f) Terrible

Q23g) Awful

8907 Q6c) Hunting season, too many in given areas.

8908 [Front cover] This has to be the biggest waste of tax dollars I have seen yet. I refuse to waste more tax money by using my valuable time to complete the survey.

8909 Q3g) If old growth is not harvested in a timely manner it will die and fall to forest floor and nobody will benefit from it!

8910 [Front cover] Soil compaction, displacement, soil erosion seemed to get over-looked by industry, agencies, public and scientist. Most cannot recognize soil compaction, how to prevent it, or mitigate the effect. I think that a lot more emphasis should be given to soil condition and productivity. If not, then the trees we have now may be the only ones we have; plus, we can fence all the riparian or remove the livestock, but still not have fish habitat and quality water. Look at the mess the upland forest is in due to forest management for logs, rather than forest management for watershed stability and water quality. If it is economical to log, we do it, rather than is it really commercial forest that is economical to regenerate. Get-the-cut-out lead to the situation your will be working on.

8911 Q6c) Logging, grazing, noise

Q9c) As opposed to cutting in virgin forests/ roadless areas.

Q9f) No more "unnatural" species only - like Douglas

Fir

Q11) introduced "non-native" fish species

Q13) [University Research Scientists - Great deal of influence] YES!

Q14) Unfortunately, the "public" tends to become the abusers of public natural resources.

Q24#2) Monitor and evaluate how theory works in practice - may need to modify approach.

8912 Q2) Only influenced public opinion management techniques!!

Q3b) Kill or control predators!!

Q8) [other] We should not allow timber to be so diseased from lack of logging to create a fire hazard and threat to Oregon both financially and physically!!

Q9b) Experienced forestry decision!!

Q14) [other] Each effected community should deal with BLM and Forest Service and Fish & Game with no effluence from environmentalist.

8913 Q1e) [equal rights] concept from the US Constitution?

8914 COM: NOTE: I appreciate what you are trying to do and I have answered the questions as well as I can. However, I'm not sure this questionnaire, either/or approval tells you much about my real feelings. There are too many qualifiers to each answer.

Q1c) [ethical] self-interest - yes

e) [rights] interests in

Q3a) No but needs to be considered

b) [protection] Just not damaging them is ok.

h) Depends on whether they are natural or not.

COM: These are extreme statements forcing an either/or choice. It really isn't that simple or that complicated.

Q5) How serious? irreversible? No

Q6c) [yes] you name it - the dams slow the flow of the river and reduce fish pops, many wildlife sanctuaries have farms in them - the noise level depends on the time of year.

Q7) [values] I don't need to be there - I just want to know it is there.

Q8) And discourage people from living in forest.

Q9) [burn or insect] These are 2 very different situations

i) We need to get over the idea we can control nature this way. I object to this, not the selective harvesting.

Q11a j k) Would be if we had more salmon. Right now there are so many other threats, I can't bother with these.

Q12) I don't see this as either/or - they need to balance if they do, it's not negative.

Q13) I don't trust any of them but we have to start somewhere.
Q14) I'm not sure it will work but it's the only fair way.
Q21) I like my NW community - but I have liked a lot of other too.
Q23) [prescribed fires] w/limitations Until nature regains its natural balance.
[let fires burn until] large human populations.
[insect outbreaks] inordinately.
[do nothing] within limits - if fire approaches an urban area, I think we need to act.

8915 Q6c) [yes] Grazing (E. side) and logging & roading & effects on riparian areas & stream habitat. Also common to see poorly located rec. sites
Q7) Stream and riparian resources esp. fish and water
Q8) Will require phase in period of controlled burn due to accumulated fuel.
Q11j) Poorly worded - does not address degree of difference - for upriver salmon dams are much more important than may other items.
1) [other] Hatchery practices
Q14) Need to be careful in defining who the public is.
Q23) Limited list of options! Priority of each depends on specific objectives.
Q3) [other] Simplistic - This doesn't assume that intensive management may be reached in some areas while others may need to recover!

8916 Q3a) Economic impacts on local communities should be considered, not because they have "high priority", but because it is important to identify and develop potential benefits and avoid unnecessary negative impacts.
Q3c) In regards to the endangered species act, it is an outrage to even consider altering otherwise sensible legislation to humor a select few companies or persons exploiting public lands which they do not even own. There is absolutely no guarantee that allowing companies to continue operating on sensitive public lands will provide steady jobs for employees. Should we alter the Clean Water Act to humor a few non-conforming sewage treatment plants or the Clean Air Act to accommodate uncontrolled toxic waste burning? Of course not! The same with the Endangered Species Act.
Q3e) As a purely practical matter, more wilderness areas are needed. The growing pressure of population dictates that even more wilderness will be necessary. Wilderness cannot be created. Wilderness, in addition to recreational, aesthetic, and spiritual values, maintains the absolutely essential reserve of genetic diversity for the preservation of myriad species. A species lost is a resource gone forever.
Q3g) This question appears to have been designed to elicit a specific response, is based on a false assumption and it ought to be discarded. Timber related jobs have begun to disappear because mechanization and technology regardless of old growth

issues. The trend can be expected to accelerate as more timber is freed up for harvest. Workers should have the help and support they need, in retraining for other jobs, in creating new jobs, or in relocating where jobs are. But they and their families will survive.

Q8) Fire should be permitted where the condition of the forest would benefit from the practice. Forests where fire has been suppressed may be vulnerable to extreme fire damage, even by controlled burns, because of excessive dead wood and undergrowth resulting from past fire suppression. Treatment of some overgrown forests may be necessary before fire can be safely used as a management tool.

Q9a b c & i) Selective logging, clearcutting in burned or insect infested areas, and selective cutting in burn or insect infested areas or to promote forest health may all be appropriate in certain places and with adequate controls. However, they may be subject to abuse. Selective logging can lead to high-grading, with loss of genetically superior trees, while trees of lesser quality are allowed to stand, thus degrading stands. Burns and insect infested areas must not become an excuse for permitting either selective logging or clearcutting.

Q9g & h) Healthy forests should not require much use of either chemical or organic pesticides. (Old growth forests developed without them.) Use of both chemical and organic insecticides and herbicides should be limited to the extent possible, with the use of biodegradable organics preferred. Some chemicals degrade through compounds more permanent and/or more toxic than the originally used material. The breakdown products should be scrutinized as carefully as the original formulation.

Q11a) Foreign trawlers and drift net are definite threats because they are not controlled.

Q11b) Salmon populations have survived and probably been shaped by El Ninos in ages past. El Nino is a probable threat now only because many salmon populations are so depressed.

Q11c) Predators are a threat chiefly because salmon populations are low and the human and natural controls of at least some predator are not active.

Q11d & e) Habitat destruction on public and private forest and range lands can and should be remedied. Incentives and penalties should be considered.

Q11g) There is absolutely no excuse for any unscreened irrigation diversions on salmon streams in the Columbia Basin. Efficient and legal water diversions and conservation practices could save water for other beneficial uses including instream flows for fish.

Q11h) Polluted water, including thermal pollution, is not just a matter of fish, public health is at stake also.

Q11i j & k) In the past, over-fishing did deplete fish populations. Now, however, Native American, gill nets, and domestic commercial and recreational fishing are among the easiest targets for control. in truth, if natural fish productivity were not

so depressed, we could have healthy fisheries.

Q11) Hatcheries are not an answer. They are a part of the problem.

Q12) This question is misleading and should be thrown out!!! The question is worded to make it sound as though there have not already be serious socioeconomic consequences due to the loss of salmon runs in the Columbia system and that there would be none in the future. As a matter of fact, the recovery of salmon runs is integral to maintaining socioeconomic health in the Columbia basin.

The past, current, and future socioeconomic impacts to local areas from commercial, sport, and tribal fisheries must be given consideration equal to other impacts. If salmon populations are not restored in the Columbia system, the socioeconomic costs will run infinitely in the future.

Q14) Ideally, a well informed public would determine policy which the agencies would then implement. Unfortunately, the public is often ill informed, hampered by lack of access to substantive and accurate information, or is misinformed by the media, employers, and special interests groups, many of whom have an economic ax to grind. Agencies may have little input from the general public, hearing chiefly from vocal special interests. Realistically therefore, the public needs a partnership with the agencies with the aim of mutual education and understanding.

Q23) Prescribed fire, and uncontrolled wildfires and insect outbreaks should only be allowed where the forest involved is in good enough condition so that they will not do more harm than good.

Q24)A combination: Intensive management for severely impacted, degraded watersheds, less intensive management for less impacted areas - Rigorous protection for watershed in good condition.

Q25) Prescribed burning would likely be more acceptable if slash burns (which often make me wonder whether I should start to pack the car) and field burning were not already degrading air quality.

8917 Thank you for asking for my input into your survey of the Columbia River Basin. Enclosed please find the completed survey material.

I have a concern for the direction we are headed in our projected management strategies, whether through your accumulated information or the overall program. Please allow me to jot some of my concerns down.

I do not believe the economic factor is being addressed in the manner of it's importance; considering the availability and cost of natural resource manipulators and their overall importance to the success or failure of the management goals and strategies.

It seems to me that if we don't prioritized the economy and focus on prevention, instead of cure; we will self destruct. Public safety and environmentally sound economics are critical. Realistically, our maximum investment can only be the overall worth of the resource. From this point we are being self destructive.

From the perspective of a person, in the "field", "on the ground", observing the "BIG picture"; at the present time, our overall resources are being managed for a catastrophic fire event, at the expense of our economic well being.

ie: We are not allowing the use of herbicides to control noxious or unwanted vegetation which ends up being fuel.

We are not allowing the use of livestock grazing to it's maximum ecological capacity to remove unwanted and/or renewable natural resources; leaving this resource as ignition material and fuel for wildfires.

We are not allowing the use of pesticides to control the devastation of our forests by insects, leaving whole areas dead and awaiting fire.

We are not allowing logging within Old Growth Forest, thereby leaving the dead, dying and diseased trees intermingled as fuel for wildfire, whereby all the trees, wildlife, and any other resources present are destroyed by fire.

We are not allowing non-catastrophic fires to burn, creating catastrophic conditions.

Public safety is not remaining a priority. We are protecting whole areas for endangered plants and animals, disallowing common sense management, creating an abundance of vegetative growth that will naturally be removed by fire, ultimately destroying the endangered and the "public" if they happen to be present.

Our local Western economy is being devastated at the cost of the above, with little or no revenues, and our National economy is being be devastated at the cost of fighting "unnecessary fire."

Our government agencies are paying undue wages for "fire fighting" and creating a "fire fund" budget item that becomes funds diversion, irresponsible management, irresponsible economics, fraud, intentionally set fires and illegitimate fires and expenditures.

Clearly our management strategies could be focused toward economic recovery for the West, in sensible fire prevention, using economically, ecologically sound management tools, mentioned above, while removing the astronomical economic drain in the cure for catastrophic fire.

"Fire" will be the name of the game as long as we refuse to responsibly manage our natural resources.

Thank you for your consideration.

Q24) Management should be allowed to address site specific issues, when needed, according to a broad spectrum of management criteria, which allows for dynamic ecological change, natural disaster and economic capability.

8919 Q6c) Logging, grazing.

Q24c) The best management is no management. Humans are the species that needs management. Let nature take of herself.

Com: 1e) This question is ambiguous. Does it mean that each group has the right to develop fully interference from another group? Humans live and develop by destroying the other two groups or their habitat, thereby preventing plants and wildlife's opportunity to live and develop.

3) The questions concerning jobs versus environment need to be put in perspective. Picture 2 hungry brothers with 1 glass of milk. One brother drinks all the milk except for a small amount in the bottom of the glass. Then the mother tells the boys that the milk must be shared. "You need to have a balance. You must have a compromise." Strange that there was no talk of compromise when the timber industry, the forest service, and the BLM were over cutting the forest in an unsustainable manner for years. Now that only a small remnant remains - old growth, salmon, you name it -- now they want to compromise on what is left. Further, timber and ranching jobs are a form of welfare. They take place on land belonging to all of us. And what do the rest of us get? We are left with ruined salmon runs, over grazed and trampled riparian areas, and clearcuts that cover the mountains like a ragged and moth eaten blanket. I would rather pay for welfare for loggers and ranchers who are unemployed than pay them to destroy our environment. And we pay them through below cost grazing fees, old water policies, subsidized building of logging roads and below cost timber sales.

6c) Many beautiful meadows and lovely stream in the Ochocos and the Malheur, Steens Mt area as well as Deshutes, Crook, and Jefferson counties have been literally trampled to dust by cattle. Dung is everywhere. One can scarcely walk more than a block in the Ochocos without encountering a logging road. Hunters use these roads so hunting pressure on deer and elk is very great. Clear cuts abound completing the scene of the truly "industrialized forest."

8) We should limit development in the interface. Then lives will not be endangered when fire occurs.

9a) I support selective logging - perhaps one or two trees per acre - by helicopter or horse - in certain areas.

b) Burns and insect infestations should be allowed to heal naturally without the added insult of logging.

h) An Oregon State University study suggests that BKT (bacterial pesticide used to kill gypsy moth and spruce budworm) also has a devastating effect on non-pest butterfly and moth larvae for at least two years, thus eliminating the primary source of food for birds, bats, rodents, and other insects and invertebrates.

111) After dams and habitat destruction in riparian areas combined with over fishing, one has to consider hatcheries as being very detrimental to wild salmon. Hatcheries came into being in order to hide the salmon declines caused by the dams and logging and grazing. Hatchery fish compete for food with wild salmon. They carry diseases into the wild stocks as well. We should get rid of all hatcheries and concentrate on restoring habitat - yes, even at the expense of our (false) economy.

11c) Seals and sea lions have always eaten salmon. We should allow them to continue to do so.

12) (Northwest Power Planning Commission) said (paraphrase) industry has prospered at the expense of the Columbia River. Now it is time to give something back.

(Intertribal Fish Commission) said (paraphrase) If we removed the science from the river (dams, hatcheries, etc...) the river will heal itself.

13) National public opinion and urban communities may contain the greatest numbers of educated, enlightened people when it comes to saving the forests and rivers from those who have a vested political - economic interest in ruining them, exploiting them.

14) There is an ethic to be upheld as regards public land and neither the public nor the agencies can help if this ethic is not the basis for (non) management.

20) My father and brother have a farm but do not depend entirely upon it for their livelihoods.

Q21) I would rather live within the community of nature than in any other community.

Additional general comments: My answers to the questions about trust in the agencies reflect my strongly held and repeatedly reinforced (by agency actions) beliefs that the agencies act totally for the benefit of the timber industry. I think everyone knows this. One has only to read the Inner Voice (AFFSEE) to get a clear picture. This is mostly the old boy top management levels of the agencies...There are many good but powerless people in every agency. Back to the timber communities. What right has any individual or community to expect jobs to be provided year in and year out so that they do not have to leave the community to seek opportunities elsewhere? We had to do that. It is a fact of life.

8919 Q24c) Maintain a healthy and vigorous forest and range for maximum watershed protection. Observe existing watersheds and copy.

8920 Com: Comments in regard to the questions. 1a. Plant and animal fiber are the only renewable resources we have, they should be managed for their beneficial and continued use. Beneficial use is not necessarily consumptive. We should not lock ours up to look at with a resultant mismanagement in other countries.

b. I don't think we were created to rule but were given the ability to manage.

c. Disease causing organisms do not warrant protection.

e. People have always been an impact on the environment. The trade off for our way of life creates a detrimental impact on some other species. If some do not adapt to the changing environment, they may become extinct. It has been a way of life since life began.

2. The environmental problems that exist on our public lands are a result of past

administrations (and Congress) directions to provide products demanded (as reflected by budgets) the land management agencies should respond, provided it is good resource management.

3. Land management agencies should not subsidize local communities by maintaining un-needed offices or by emphasizing harvesting products that are not good resource management. Endangered species laws should be changed to require an EIS PRIOR TO designation. This assessment would consider the impact on the economy and other uses.

7. A quality place to live includes all the responses to differing degrees.

11. "Habitat Destruction" has never been definitely defined that I have heard. To some people a cow eating a mouthful of grass or a tree being cut within 100' of a stream is destructive-no way!!! Cows or equipment mucking around in a stream now that can be destructive. Unless of course the mucking machine is doing "habitat restoration" work, then any amount of mucking is ok. As I said earlier, there is a price to our society.

13. Public land management should be done by the professionals that have been hired to do the job. I only moderately trust them because they have succumbed to the pressures from idiots that have no resource background.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

8921 Q24) considering the poor condition of the forest at the present time. I believe intense management for the short-term is required. After that the forest itself will tell the astute observer what management is needed, and when.

8922 Q1a) We have with animals mutual needs and need to ensure all of them are taken care of.

Q6c) The lack of management has ruined the health and attractiveness of our forest. This problem has been caused by the preservationist movement and the resulting political policies.

Q8) fire may be used in combo with other activities for good management.

Q11) Most of these activities occurred for several years, but major declines have occurred since the dams. All other issues have been regulated and reduced their impact.

Q26) The agencies were doing a good job of ecosystem management until the administrative changed. Now they are doing nothing.

8924 Q14) Combine 2 and 3.

8926 Q6c) Motorized recreation, jet skis, dirt bikes, four wheelers and all the equipment, coolers, chairs, tools, trailers, parking lots, etc.

Q11d) Except at key passage points such as Ballard Locke.

Q111,j) Under a condition of low fish populations.
Q13a-m) This is not promising.
Q14) Insist on integrity, honesty peer review an absence of politics-->primary objective: sustainability over time for all space.
Q23c) depends on the rules.
Q23f) Under natural conditions this may work - but natural conditions do not exist. There is no "balance" e.g. what natural order would "check" an outbreak?
Q24c) Use both approaches based upon sub areas needs and conditions.

- 8929 Q8) Presuming we choose not to harvest timber!
- 8930 Q8) We should use a combination of tools including prescribed fire, logging, thinning, controlled fire, and let burn to protect ecological health of forests, salmon, wildlife, and watersheds.
Q11) Public demand for acreage.
- 8931 Q6c) White trash does camp. No offense intended!
- 8932 Q7r) Mineral rights development.
Q8) Use of multiple use management programs dependent upon what stage of development the forest is in.
Q10) Since no comprehensive study has not been performed for the council, I am probably more informed than the bureaucrats.
Q11b) Moving salmon to Alaska.
Q14) Establish long range multiple use management plans with advisory board from local communities and industry. Then stay with it.
Q23) Are you crazy? What background do you have in preparing a comprehensive and objective questionnaire? Answer: None!
Q24) Public Land? Or Private.
Q24a) This is not an option in my opinion.
- 8933 Q8e) All of above are incorrect. Fire is a tool to be used - and it should be used on all federal lands. To reduce the serious existing problem.
Q23d-g) These are ludicrous.
- 8934 Q1d) Or at least distributed differently -- the US is OK -- some Asian countries are seriously overcrowded.
Q3g) Not more but AS important.
Q7a) Our quality of life will be seriously affected with curtailment of logging and/or grazing, but a healthy ecosystem is vital for us all.
Q8e) Combination of 2 and 3 - use pesticides and salvage logging as a 1st step

followed by burning of excess fuels.

Q11d,e) Minimal threat.

Q13k) Not the opinion, but accurately determining and documenting that opinion.

Q14) #4 ideally, but most of the public wishing to participate have strong views and on side of the issues, and aren't really willing to listen or compromise.

Q26) Both agencies have able staff, but the organizational structure, mandated red tape, etc., inhibit their ability to move forward in a clear, consistent manner.

8935 Q6c) Crowding, mining

Q8e) No suppression but emphasis on education of land owners on how to live in ecosystems that have evolved with wildfire.

8937 Q11d,e) Generally overstated in the press.

8940 Q8e) We should use integrated pest management philosophy and use all options available.

Q24) Consideration of both [a and b]!

8941 Q8e) No firefighters life is worth saving my property and trees.

Q11l) ORV damage

Q14) Public should decide management direction and the prof should carry it out - (MFMA-ESA- Clean water act, etc).

Com: Dear Dr. Steel, Yes I would like a copy of the results of the Columbia River Basin survey. However, if you just give me the answer to the first question I could probably guess the rest. I strenuously object to the wording of many of your questions i.e. Sec 2 g. "Survival of timber workers and their families is more important than preservation of old growth forests." In areas where old growth has been given a priority can you tell me how many families have not survived? Did they die as your survey implies? Two mills have closed in Prineville, and over 70% of the timber sales have been halted to protect the remaining old growth. To the best of my knowledge all of the timber workers and their families have survived. This question could have been better written. "In nationally owned forests, is destroying the remaining old growth and the species dependant upon them worth it to maintain the economic comfort level of a small segment of Northwest populations?"

Sec 2.i, Should read "Federal rangeland management should continue to emphasize livestock grazing over other uses." As that is what they already do.

It is interesting to me that you move from one commodity to another, timber or grazing verses salmon. Most of us are not concerned about spotted owls or salmon but the ecosystem that they are dependant upon. Remember indicator species and their purpose?

As for the supplemental part-you are asking site specific questions without site

specific information. At a previous EEMO meeting there was a general uproar about this part. Most of the people there, ranchers, timber reps, environmentalist, etc. objected to the wording and stated that they could not respond to the question. Do you personally prefer surgical removal or medications? Wouldn't it help to know if we are discussing a stomach ache or a rupture appendix.

It is evident that our input was totally disregarded. Does that tell you why we answered the section on trust as we did? With such blatant disregard for public opinion is there any hope for the final outcome?

My personal bottom line is that this plant and the integrity of the biological community that supports it is more important than any individual. In fact, our species is probably one of the few species that could be exterminated without the planet suffering any ill effects.

8942 Q17) M.S. Geology, plus 45 hrs.

Q24c) Selectively harvest 3 or 4 percent every year on most of the property like I do on most of my property.

Com: Q-1; not appropriate. Q-3; poor question, proper decisions will provide both good economies and good forestry.

Q-13: Having spent much of the last 50 years working in the woods of northeast Oregon, I probably would not let any of them manage my land. Q-17: My grandfather homesteaded in Wallowa County in 1885; he logged and ranched as did my father. I was raised on a ranch near Wallowa and learned to fell trees with a cross-cut saw in the late 1930s. I developed and taught a forestry class at the High School level for 6 or 7 years. My partner and I were the Oregon Tree Farmers of the year in 1984 and 1991; we were also runner-up for the National Tree Farmer of the year in 1992.

I currently manage about 2,000 acres of private timberland which is in far better condition than the adjoining U.S. Forest Service land. Between myself, my wife, and our five children, we have about 45 years of college experience with degrees in Geology, Geography, Biology, Law, Nursing, Diesel Power, and Political Science. We all agree, however, that our hands-on, practical woods experience is worth more than all the years of formal education in terms of understanding the forest and timber management.

Q-23: I cannot rank these management practices in a personal preference because most of these practices would not be allowed on land that I manage. We selectively log about 3% of our volume each year on our tree farm; this is about 435 boardfeet per acre per year, and after 24 years we still have as much as we started with. The timber is bigger and of better quality, and our harvest is 4 times the allowable cut on the adjacent U.S. Forest Service property where nothing is being done. Twenty years ago I opposed removing the large, woody debris from streams and the felling of snags, to no avail. Currently, I oppose subsoiling (ripping up the so-called

compaction) because it is doing far more damage than good. I also oppose burning most of the woody debris (prescribed fire) as this is the material that should be allowed to rot; this practice is very destructive and will drastically lower the productivity of the site.

When fir invades a pine site the stand should be managed as mixed species site (the utopia of every forester) and not converted back to a stand of just pine, because "at least 108 species of insects attack Ponderosa pine" U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Handbook 271.

- 8943 Q2) There are some isolated problems with current management but that happens in all public and private businesses. These lands are mostly improving every year.
Q3f) Plant communities are already protected but some are rare in Oregon but abundant in other states.
Q3h) Allowing insects to destroy income to our national economy is a sin to nature and our God that produces them.
Q8e) We need renewable trees to support our economy.
Q13) Note: Western communities take care of the environment because they have to protect it to live. They should have the final "say" on any changes that effect their world. Not the people who aren't affected by these changes.
Q14e) That was what the forest plan did - why was it abandoned.
Q23) Trees need to be harvested to pay for the recovery of the forest or we will have to use tax dollars. This needs to be done while there is a value.
Q26) Some of the locals want to do a good job but the higher ups could care less. All they want is a promotion. Make the promotion subject to the health and economical uses of the land or forest.
- 8944 Q8) We should reintroduce fire where practical, salvage dead and dying timber than aggressive management actions to restore forest health.
- 8945 Q1c,e) Not a question of 'rights'; It is a question of rational maintenance and renewal of ecosystems, ie. interdependency.
Q6b) Logging grazing and especially cumulative effects of heavy handed sup-
optimal/myopic management.
Q8e) Suppress only if ecologically indicated, and secondarily human lives. Your question has a very limited spectrum, folks.
Q9e) Of course it all depends upon how selective, who selects (marking crew or forester with experience).
- 8946 24a) Include local government in management plans (counties etc.) Always left out in govt. plans!!!

- 8947 [Front Cover] This is the most biased unprofessional survey I have seen. It is truly a shame government is wasting money on such a mess. I request this not be used and the below signed not be paid.
- Q1b) Man was created to have Dominion.
 - Q1c) Very poor question
 - Q2) Not uncertain, just feel that there are some environmental problems.
 - Q3a) Should have equal priority.
 - Q3b) If you change, too.
 - Q3h) If you would act quickly you can be effective.
 - Q3l) This needs to be a site specific use.
 - Q5) Not uncertain, some environmental problems.
 - Q23b) After you make current fuel loads.
 - Q23e) Only if you will assume that you can stop them at the line.
 - Q24c) Make management decisions on a site specific basis that would give you a reasonable chance of success. Blanket prescriptions almost never work.
 - Q26) These would be considerably different if the local professionals were allowed to perform their duties.
- 8948 Q6c) Cows and evidence of past logging disturbed me.
- 8953 Com: Noxious weeds are expanding exponentially and little is being done to implement known, effective and economical technology.
- 8954 Q2) Serious problem relative to what?
- Q3h) Tough question. Many outbreaks are management caused.
 - Q6c) Overgrazed riparian areas.
 - Q11l) Habitat/riparian modification upstream from salmon spawning areas.
 - Q23d) ? For what reason.
 - Q23e) Only after fuels are reduced to "natural" levels.
 - Q26) USFS has good/ok research staff but I do not trust FS line officers/NFS.
- 8955 Q8e) Suppress fire in all federal forests, however controlled fires may be used to enhance forest health.
- Q11l) Flushing of Columbia River by letting excessive amounts of water over upstream dams.
- 8956 Q6c) Logging
- Q7h) All others are dependent on this.
 - Q9b) As a policy or standard practice.
 - Q9c) Depends on site-specific conditions-impacts.
 - Q9d) Political question

Q9e) Where site-specific conditions warrant it.

Q11) politics

Com: Dear Sirs, The majority of the questions in your survey require simplistic responses that reduce complicated resource issues to political tripe. The respondent is required to express opinions that in no way reflect the complicated nature of the issues and/or possible solutions. Does this constitute a vote on how lands in the CRB will be managed? For example, Q-1 sets up the humans verses nature syndrome, disregarding the fact that humans are dependant on the health of the natural world, i.e. clean water, etc. for survival. It is not a matter of whether (d.) "the earth should have far fewer people on it." It is a matter of how resources will be managed, given the world population's impending expansion, so that humans cannot only survive but the quality of human life is maintained, i.e., the natural world is not destroyed by the impacts of resource extraction and use.

Q-3, g. is also typical. It is a loaded question that demands a simplistic response to a complicated issue, again pitting the preservation of the natural world against socio/economic issues. The question should be: is timber workers and their families' "survival" dependant on cutting old growth forests? The issue raised in Q-3, h and Q-8 are becoming the subject of enormous political debate, whereas they should be a matter of scientific research, and certainly can only be answered at the site-specific level. Every timber stand in every forest is unique; generalizations cannot be made regarding forest health or the use v. suppression of fire.

Q-9 requires "blanket statement" type responses to complicated forest management and regulation questions. This is the type of mentality, that "one size fits all," that has been the cause of mis-management by public land managers and let to the serious environmental problems that exist in the CRB.

Q-12, again politicizes a complicated issue, the recovery of the salmon, by pitting people against the fish. I h ink you seriously missed the boat on this one, since the Pacific Northwest economy will suffer greatly if the salmon is not recovered. What was it? 60,000 jobs?

Q-13 again requires generalizations that are meaningless. All the agencies, entities mentioned have a certain sphere of influence and elicit some level of trust or distrust. How is this pertinent to decisions regarding the management of the CRB? Is some other entity going to be put in charge? The entity that has historically had the most influence on resource management in the CRB is missing from the list: industry including timber, mining and agriculture.

Q-22 sums it all up as far as this survey is concerned. Why bother asking the other questions? I have declined to answer the questions in the Supplemental CRB Survey for the reasons iterated above, i.e., the answers depend on site-specific micro-conditions and the environmental impacts of implementing any of the suggested land management "tools" on a particular site.

The public's trust in agency ability and motive is not the issue. If decisions regarding

future management of the CRB are politically, rather than scientifically based, natural resources will continue to be adversely impacted and depleted at a rate greater than they can recover. Your survey appears to be a poll of the adversarial attitudes that are a major obstacle to solving the enormous ecological problems that we now face in the CRB, and by being such, encourages those attitudes to prevail over reason and finding solutions.

- 8957 Q6c) Noisy boats, logging trucks.
Q8) Stacked questions. Good answer but not available. Somewhere between #3 and #4.
Q9d) When needed
Q9) Better yet, implement current rules and regulations.
Q9f) Enforce current regulations.
Q9h) loaded
Q11c) When salmon population is low.
Q12) "No win" situation
Q14f) Social expectations for accountability, with retribution for failure.
- 8958 Q14f) #5 above except substitute the word "policy" or "management."
- 8959 Q8e) #2 and #3 combined.
Q24c) This should not be an "either/or" choice. Both can provide the best tools depending on the circumstance.
Com: Re: Survey of Natural Resource Issues In the Columbia River Basin. I am uncomfortable with several of the choices offered in the questionnaire.
Q-2 - "No environmental problems...or Serious problems" is not a realistic choice. There are a few problems, but none are catastrophic.
Q-9 (a,b,i) - I support selective logging, but this does not mean I want to exclude clearcutting or other prescriptions.
Q-11 - I was uncomfortable with "probable threat..." (e) through (h) could be threats, but are not "probable" if prudent measures are taken to mitigate potential harmful practices.
Q-13 - The choices are too broad, I have a great deal of trust in some of the experienced people in agencies. But, there are too many neophyte specialists with severe tunnel vision to allow me to judge and grade an entire agency, district (or a department within). There are too few "experienced hands" that know the lay of the land well enough to make informed decisions. Choices made by politicians and public opinion are often faulty because the people are usually uninformed about the issues so their decisions are mostly based upon emotional prejudices.
Supplemental Q-23 - I want to harvest trees, but not be limited just to ways that mimic natural disturbances. I am concerned about what conclusions will be drawn

from an answer supporting "natural" - does this preclude "unnatural" ways? I found ranking my personal preferences of these particular management practices rather meaningless. Firewood gathering has little to do with letting wildfires burn uncontrolled.

I will conclude my comments by admitting my skepticism about more planning. I have been directly involved in RARE I, RARE II, and several forest plans. Little, if any, was done with the voluminous information collected and the plans made to manage the lands. I concur totally with _____ when he recently said: "None of this planning, endless planning will have any meaning unless the administration and congress get together to develop some measure of immunity from endless appeal and litigation by zealots who are not willing to accept balanced compromise." Our local National Forests have compromised until timber sales are less than 1/3 of the current forest plan ASQ. Now the "ONRC" has decided that no timbering or grazing should occur on public lands and they appeal nearly every decision made. I also agree with John Beuter when he said more regulations result in "...layers of vague environmental laws that virtually eliminate practical decisions space." (Especially if the decision maker is not familiar with the area or is not impacted by the decision). Some city folks think you can hang cows on a nail until the range opens.

- 8964 1. I think you should allow more time for people to respond to your survey. You are conducting it when a lot of people may be on vacation and who won't be able to respond within such a short time span.
2. Question 20 of the survey should be expanded on. You should also ask how many people in one's family have already lost their timber related jobs!!
- 8965 Q3b) Greater than what? PACFISH-No.
Q3h) NO-Get the landscape healthy first!
Q9b,c) Assuming all are dead.
Q10) "5" Relative to the general population.
Q11d,e) Under current practices.
Q11k) Under current practices.
Q11) This section is ridiculous. What difference does it make what everyone feels? The question is what are the facts?
Q24) Depends on the situation. If the risk is high, go extensive; if not focus where the need and conditions warrant.
- 8966 Q23) You have listed 7 items-some require the same answer.
Q24) Management has to be ongoing in order to be effective and maintain forest viability-and management must be all encompassing-not selective.
- 8967 Q1d) Given the current dependence on/distribution of natural resources.

Q3d) Which species? Needs clarification (sensitive species?)
 Q3e) Not if weed control , wildlife, habitation etc. is precluded. Perhaps after restoration...
 Q3g) They are not mutually exclusive. Workers and families will still survive.
 Q6c) Grazing-the noise, stench, trampling of sites, presence of barbwire fences.
 Q8: 5) We can begin long term use of prescribed fire in conjunction with thinning to eventually make #4 possible.
 Q9d) Short term solution until other incentives are introduced. We have the laws/rules already. Enforcement is what is needed (until as I said other incentives for protection can be realized. This may take generations).
 Q9i) Case by case. Disease is not always bad.
 Q11) The cumulative effects make it difficult to separate these. Dams and habitat destruction are the big ones...
 Q13: 12,13) An ironic conclusion and also idealistic I realize. I truly advocate intrinsic incentives vs, regulation as motive for "good" land management.
 Q20) I do forest ecology/natural history education funding by timber monies.
 Q23c) Regulated and enforced.
 Q23d) Along with artificial nest/roost program.
 Q23e) Bring yarded hollow trees back on site and attach to standing trees.
 Q23f) In conjunction with efforts that increase insect predator populations.
 Q24) I would prefer to see the timing and duration of the activities scheduled according to what is best for the non-human ecological integrity of the area.
 Q26) As defined by current land management laws and administrative rules. I believe many agency personnel have great ability to carry out their version of their mission-and that so many capable people within the agencies are disabled by disfunction within the agency.

8968 Q6c) Often-especially logging, grazing and too many roads a little wildlife left!
 Q8: 5) People should not live in a fire ecology ecosystem if they "can't stand the heat." We should return to the natural ecosystem and learn to live again in harmony with nature.
 Q9f) No commercial grazing on public lands!
 Q9g) NEVER!!
 Q9i) Does not prevent but furthers the spread and compounds existing problems with yet more!
 Q11b) Natural-No. Global warming industrially caused-Yes.
 Q11i) This issue is up to sovereign native nations and traditional peoples to decide and given treaty guarantees is not subject to US government or citizen regulation or intervention.
 Q13) "4" Traditional Native Peoples "4"
 "4" Grassroots environmental Activists "4"

"5" Actual needs of the ecosystem, wildlife and future generations "5"

Q14)

Q111) Subsistence fishing (small scale and regulated) "3".

Q14) Humans need to re educate themselves and alter their social systems to fit in harmony with the natural world-before they should be allowed any say in any further managing. BLM, USFS and responsible officials should be fired and disbanded. We NEED a complete ecological and social revolution!

Q18) Honest, compassionate, and an activist-the above is a corrupt linear mess.

Q21) But my community is the natural world.

Q23a) No "Harvest" of trees until such future time as the forest ecosystem is healthy and functioning with abundant wildlife throughout them only harvests which mimic natural disturbances within the range of natural variability.

Q23d) Only when absolutely necessary for wildlife needs in restoring habitat OK.

Q23) Remove roads (returning to natural forest condition), reintroduce fire, plant nitrogen fixing forbes in clear cuts which have failed to regenerate, ban commercial livestock grazing, restore streams (without heavy machinery) and also wait for time and natural processes to heal the land. Restore wildlife habitat and reintroduce missing native species wherever feasible-wolf, grizzly, fish, peregrin, etc. Respect native traditional rights and methods and educate the public on forest ecology.

Q24) If harvesting is a part of your solution we will fight your bogus man-agement!!!
NO HARVEST, NO HEAVY MACHINES IN THE FOREST. Identify critical problem areas-heavy sedimentation in streams,non-regenerating cut areas, high road density areas, and areas severely in need of underburning. Coordinate activities in these areas first with awareness of the habitat, nesting and rearing needs of wildlife(and migration patterns) so as to have minimal impact.

Q26) We need independent grassroots activists, traditional native peoples, biological scientists working together, educating the public and reforming these agencies giving strong voice to wildlife needs to have any hope of ecological success!!!

8970 Both are unacceptable. Many areas should not be "managed" at all since "management" always means logging.

8971 Q23b) Cannot answer as written.

Q24) Can't answer without knowing intensity of harvest, duration of burn. I do believe that all else being equal, #1 is worse than #2.

Q25) Can't answer as written.

8973 Q13:1,2) Pre 1993 standards of operating.

Q14) Re: 2 "Resource professionals" include those who use the resource since they have the experience.

Q26) Heretofore, I would have had trust in the ability and motives of the BLM and

the Forest Service to manage the forest and range fairly, with understanding of forest and range health, and with respect for renewable resources.

Now I have no trust in the agencies' abilities or motives. The personnel in the field want to do a commendable job but directives from those in Washington, D.C. who are ignorant of the deplorable conditions of the forest, tie their hands. Those directives are responsible for the present sorry condition of the forest. I don't know what the forest is being managed for now but it's certainly not for a "scientifically sound, ecosystem based strategy" and I'm not sure that anyone knows what that is. Q23) You will notice that I have omitted two statements and had to call the forest service for an explanation. I don't see how you can call this managing.

In the total survey, the economy of the region was not given consideration!

8974 Q11) Wildfires.

Q24) Manage entire watershed with common sense and sustainable ASQ values!

8976 Q6c) Logging noise(ATV's, snowmobile) clearcutting and destruction of habitat, roads.

Q9h) Depends on the reason.

Q13: 10,11) Depends on who is driving force behind.

Q14) Science should be the driving force behind federal lands management.

Q23a) I have found that agencies equate clear cuts with fire when they are not the same, have different impacts.

Q23b) I would rather see natural fires allowed to burn.

Q23e) This is difficult without a definition of land management values.

Q24) I do not believe there is a cut and dried response to this question without looking at the level of analysis conducted for old growth, T and E species, fisheries, wildlife, habitat fragmentation etc.

Q25) I would be very willing to accept reduced air quality if natural fires were allowed to burn but I do not feel that the FS has the expertise or has conducted a thorough analysis of prescribed fires. For example, FS documents prescribe fire in the spring with no analysis of impacts to plants and soils from burning at this unnatural time for the northern rockies ecosystem.

8977 Q8) Suppress all wildfires on public lands, use controlled fire.

Q11) Competing fish "1".

Q14) Let local people and counties manage the land.

Com) Throughout the survey you sent me I found numerous requests to choose between agricultural activity or fish and wildlife. I feel this is a false choice since most areas of agriculture can co exist with wildlife if properly managed. No environmental gain will accomplished by banning mining, timber, or agriculture in the Columbia river basin. Because demand for these products will remain the same. For

an example when timber harvest is banned in the northwest, people don't stop building homes. Thus the lumber has to come from another part of the world, often third world countries with little or no environmental laws. Therefore, banning a product to save one or two species, puts thousands of species in jeopardy. Wildlife also adapts to better survive human activity. When this activity is stopped suddenly species are often damaged.

- 8979 Q6c) Crowding sometimes.
Q11l) Competition from other fish like shad or squawfish.
Q25) Depends on what the ecological objectives are.
- 8981 Q3h) Depends on situation! Oppose most pesticides.
Q6c) Crowding, noise, logging.
Q9b) This increases erosion.
Q23b) This tool isn't always used wisely.
Q23f,g) Depends on the situation.
Q24) I would need more information on expected results to answer this question.
- 8983 Q8) Fire is a tool and should only be used when it is the right tool to accomplish a management objective.
- 8985 Q6c) Massive disruptions to plant communities due to clear cuts and overgrazing-wrecks the scenery too.
Q24) Mixture of 1 and 2 depends on the sensitivity of the area.
- 8986 Q6c) Logging, grazing, mining and RV's.
Q8) We should never suppress fire or let people reside on or adjacent to public lands.
Q11l) Hatcheries.
Q14) Set policy to be enforced.
Q24) Focus on restoration and sustainability of native biodiversity.
- 8987 Q6c) Too many people, cars, trucks, cows.
- 8988 Q2) However, not entirely due to management practices but to biopopulation trends "overcrowding"-overpopulation, poor land use planning in urban/rural overlap areas.
Q3a) Give priority not privilege.
Q3d) Do not need to manage for nuevo trends of elk (too many)!
Q3g) You cannot pressure old growth forever-OG needs to be managed for.
Q6c) Grazing, guns, ATV's, drunken ----- in pick up trucks.
Q8) 1994 fire season: 20 fatalities as of 8/15; getting harder to fight fire, we must

treat fuels now!

Q8: 5) You are leaving the increasing urban interface out of the equation; limit growth.

Q9d) Decrease elk populations and non-endemic species. Why do we promote so many elk?

Q9f) Determine ecological carrying capacity, not economic carrying capacity.

Q11j) Boon doggle.

Q11) Get rid of NFMA and ODFW ocean regulations, such as releasing hooked silvers during commercial COHO seasons once hooked, silvers die-dumb! dumb! dumb!

Q14) Educate, inform, involve on an equal basis; more education needed in elementary and secondary schools.

Q23a) Including large stand replacement disturbances.

Q23e) This is ludicrous without prescribed fire plans and conditions and cannot be accomplished in today's modern urban interface.

Q24: 1) These statements are BS; don't forget about the time it takes NEPA to go into action.

Q24: 3) Public consensus is a myth. Work on informed consent. "Consensus" is passe, it doesn't work; it's a breeding ground for polarized gladiators-work on consent.

Com) Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this survey.

I am not a member of any organization, wise-use, or environmental group. I am "silent minority." But there are many who are fed up with "groups" not letting agencies get on with management.

Perhaps the 1994 wildfire season will reveal to some of these idiots that something should be done to reduce fuels/gain fiber/enhance ecosystem health without mother nature running her course. Nature has reintroduced fire in 1994-not dealing with the excessive fuel loads is human kinds problem-not hers. I've been on many of the fires-20 fatalities later you think some politicos might wise up. There are serious problems out there, to do nothing and "hug" dead snags is sinful.

8990 Q3g) Survival yes, but maintenance of that particular job is something else.

Q12) Such negative consequences will be leveled out in the long run if the salmon recover.

Q24) Don't know.

8991 Q11i) Development "1", Flood control "1", Dredging "1", Industrial Park Development "1", Hatcheries "1".

8992 Q24) 2-If wilderness/biological reserves are established.

Com) The complexity of the issues defies the simplicity of the questions. This, just

when extreme points of view and deliberate misinformation have become acceptable means of interest group communication and political action. Under these conditions, rational dialogue, identification of good science, and deliberate solutions are in real jeopardy. Add to that the entrenched vested interests who how to work the lack of ethics and political corruption in congress, and the tendency of Administrations to play politics during election year and half (18 mo. campaigns), leaves the outcome grim in spite of the fact that we are well embarked into the next era of national and global human activity (ie. hard nosed disputes over diminishing resources.

There needs to be achieved, and yesterday, a national consensus for Sustainable Existence and Use of the whole natural resource base for the Broadest Range of Uses (aesthetics, genetic storehouse, ecological, scientific, recreational, ethical, educational, economic etc.). Government resource agencies need to get out and lay it on the line, eg like the water spreading issue-it's uncomfortable, and it hurts but it has to be done.

Like the President did with health care, GET OUT IN FRONT (though he may have dawdled away the advantage), draw out the implications of "business as usual" so that the public sees the down the road implications for their kids.

GET OUT IN FRONT-Otherwise, in the fertile ground of skepticism, ignorance, and suspicion, nourished by the tabloid-like barrage of media and newsletter verbal manure, the special interests will sow doubt and perception that back room deals are being made to take "rights" (spell wants).

8993 Q6c) Military aircraft overflight.

Q8) Suppress wild fire to protect human life and property while using prescribed fire to lessen fuel buildup while easing into a more natural fire regime. In the meantime suppress fires that have potential for causing major resource loss.

Q14) Provide suggestions and serve in advisory boards.

Q23e) Unless within wilderness and with a fire management plan.

Q23f) Except in wilderness.

8994 Q6c) Crowding.

Q7: 18) Balance of economics/economic health.

8995 Q6c) Logging definitely subtracts from your satisfaction in "getting away." This may account for some of the over-crowding in more pristine areas.

Q9i) Not sure this is possible.

Q12) I believe in the long run there will be very positive consequences. [1] This has already been tried [7].

Q13) Although I grew up in a rural community, for obvious reasons, will support most anything that favors them financially, regardless of the big picture.

Q23) Unsure if this can be done.

- 8996 Q11l) Predatory fish-walleye.
- 8997 Q11l) Walleye, squawfish and bass.
- 8998 Q8: 5) No. 3 and odd use pesticides and or salvage logging.
 Q11f) Some.
 Q19: 6) White and Native American.
 Q24) Prescribed fire, harvesting and replant within two years and use of chemicals also to maintain a healthy forest as needed when all else fails.
- 8999 Q6c) Industrial forestry, tree farming, industrial livestock.
- 9000 Q6c) Logging-grazing. I deserve pristine forests for wildlife.
 Q11l) Grazing.
- 9001 Q6c) Too much logging.
- 9002 Q6c) Grazing destroyed riparian, logging-clearcuts.
 Q23a) Don't harvest.
 Q24) Halt all "harvest" and grazing until there is complete recovery.
- 9003 Noise from generators in campgrounds, mountainbikes on steep narrow hiking trails; conflicts with snowmobiles when cross country skiing.
- 9004 Q11l) Competing non-native sport fishing fish.
 Q24) The land condition dictates what type of management practice is needed. We need professionals that can read the land like one reads a book and have a full range of management options available to use.
- 9005 Q1b) Rule and protect as use occurs.
 Q1c) Yes, as it is possible without undue sacrifice.
 Q2) Too much office management and waste of money and not enough practical or helpful or support of users and changes they are trying.
 Q3a) As these people know what will work and is practical.
 Q3b) Just use correctly rules already there.
 Q3d) Again, use correctly and get the money out of office and out to land.
 Q3f) Put money allocated for such in the field work with private users. Preference during change should be given to them and use them for help.
 Q3i) That's how it was set up years ago and guaranteed when U.S. government was allowed to control such use with proper hands on management and cooperation. Money used up in bureaucracy could overcome problems very quickly.

Q5) Problems showing in all areas for last ten years are big result of a drought which environmentalists refuse to recognize.

Q7: 18) Hunting.

Q8: 5) Use logging where can or any product use, if feasible.

Q9d) Just implement what has been suggested and get money to work not in office work, where it is needed not just because a group in New York signed a petition.

Q9f) Just work with users to improve conditions.

Q11) These are loaded questions, not totally expressing each topic.

Q13) My trust in government agencies is low as for influence they should have it but it needs to be better informed and hands on education not environmental pressures.

Q19) French, Indian, English.

Q22) I am a BLM permittee interested in wise use.

Q23) Harvest wisely before each occurs.

9006 Q8: 5) We should suppress fire in all federal forests and salvage log if forest health is endangered. NEVER LET FIRE GO UNCONTROLLED.

Q11) Drawdowns "1."

Q24) Be versatile and not locked in to one way on the other, conduct full range management as needed. If the forest block is healthy and growing well, leave it alone but if treatment is needed, be quick to utilize forest products before they waste.

Q23) This question is the most slanted question in this slanted survey. First of all, nobody I know was contacted to give input on the "tools" to be used to accomplish broad scale ecological objectives. Most people who are going to be impacted the most by these "tools" are working too much to come to your meetings where all these "tools" were identified. However, if you folks have your way we'll all have time. I want to comment on these "tools" one at a time.

Harvest trees in ways that mimic natural disturbances.

I believe we should harvest trees, but I disagree in mimicking natural disturbances. Natural disturbances are brutal most times. There are ways to harvest that are low impact and make the forest healthier. Two ways I strongly support are: Harvest dead, dying over-ripe and high risk. The second way would be to harvest down to 14 inch diameter breast high.

Use prescribed fire to reduce forest diseases insects, and excessive fuel levels. Prescribed fire should only be used after merchantable trees have been removed Allow non-commercial firewood gathering. This activity should be classified as freedom, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Furthermore, it is also a basic need for a good number of people.

Girdle trees and leave them in place. This management tool is absolutely the most asinine activity ever conceived by mankind. Twenty-five to thirty years ago on adjacent Potlatch land this practice was implemented. Being in my backyard so to speak, I personally observed the outcome of this practice. It should be outlawed!

If removal of certain trees is the management prescribed, I am sure that "light touch" methods of removal can be invented so that precious fiber and jobs are not lost forever. Ask Potlatch Corporation about their grand experiment and how fifteen years later they needed pulp but someone had girdled all the trees. Things change and girdling is like suicide, a permanent solution for a temporary problem.

Let wildfires burn without attempting to control them unless they threaten adjoining land management values. I know that fire is a part of the natural order of things, however so are volcanoes and earthquakes. We have some control on one of these catastrophic events and I believe we should exercise that control. We will have plenty of areas burnt by fire without just letting one go on its own.

Let insect outbreaks run their natural course unless they begin to threaten adjoining land management values. Treatment by harvest should be implemented immediately upon the identification of an insect outbreak. Once insects get a foothold they could prove to be unstoppable.

Do nothing, wait for time and natural processes to accomplish ecological outcomes. It seems crazy to me to do nothing when you possess the power to increase the quality of the forest by tried and true management practices. I suppose letting AIDS run its natural course sounds good to some.

9009 Q6c) Grazing logging.

9010 Q3i) What other uses?

Q14) Local public and professionals should manage public lands, NOT NATIONAL.

9011 Q11i) Sewage dumped into waters.

Q13) State government [2-4]

Q22) What is wise use? How about listing multiple use...

Q23) If we do this, then let's let nature take its course with salmon and the owl...evolve or extinct.

Q24) "Federal lands" belong to the states. Let citizens of the states decide.

Q25b) Would change plans and go when no burning.

9012 Q7: 18) Economic stability.

Com) The questions do not allow answers that exactly fit the situations. The world is not just black or white and even the most positive or negative responses require qualification and explanation.

9013 Q26) No trust at all in any of the above.

9014 Q8) Just use common sense like we did in years past.

Q14) Let CRB people decide.

- Q23d) Stupid.
- Q24) Use common sense, go back to the way we did it 25 or so years ago. It worked then and it will work now.
- 9021 Q23a) Reduce commercial logging drastically.
 Q23b) A possibly useful but improbable tool.
 Q23e) This could be used beneficially but guardedly.
 Q23f) This depends greatly on the type of insect and what their normal food/habitat is.
 Q23g) This is the best in many, but not all, cases. We have impinged on nature too much and really go back to ground zero.
 Q24) This is too general-both approaches must be considered depending upon what ecological conditions exist. Why can't government develop intelligent, responsible flexibility?
- 9023 Q13) PAC conservation organizations and Industrial organizations do not necessarily advocate sound long-term management. The positions tend often to be one of an "irresponsible advocacy."
 Q23e) Prescribed natural fire.
 Q24) Management prescriptions must consider the ecosystem components sensitivity and the fragility of the geomorphology of the watershed-a range of #1 to #2 above as appropriate.
- 9024 Q8: 5) Fire should be re-introduced slowly to regain it's natural role in the ecosystem so ALL resource values are enhanced and/or maintained.
 Q11l) Forest management [3].
- 9025 Q7: 18) Biodiversity.
 Q8: 5) We should prescribe some fires.
 Q9e) Why pair up the roads with recreation? This section often poses some odd dichotomies.
 Q11h) Including temperature.
 Q13) Congress has the power via the constitution.
- 9026 Q6c) Darth Vader Trail Bikers, overgrazing and cattle congregating in riparian areas. Large clear-cuts, excessive slash disposal, poor logging practices.
 Q8: 5) Should obtain actual information about possible use of prescribed fire. Must recognize that man has little or no control over catastrophic forest fires.
 Q23) Compromise between alternatives because depends on conditions. No 1, could lead to "gung ho" approach that is always harmful.
 Q26) These answers pertain to the national leadership in agencies and not National

- Forests or Ranger Districts where my trust ranges with unit from great deal to nil.
- 9027 Q7: 18) Prospecting and mining.
Q8: 5) Logging will help control also.
- 9029 Q6c) I travel off trail, run into cows and clearcuts, though they do have an impact on my experience in the back country, my concern is with fragmentation of habitat, cows trampling sensitive plants and riparian habitat.
- 9031 Q6c) Clearcuts in the Colville National Forest were very depressing and put a damper on my trip.
- 9032 Q3h) If managed properly no problem.
Q9) Nature does it best man does it wrong.
Q11k) Too many people.
Q22) I'm for the people.
Q24) Let the people take care.
- 9035 Q6c) Hard to get away from evidence of human activities.
Q8: 5) Use fire for specific management, but protect timber and limited habitats.
Q13) Should not be singled out as a separate public.
Q24) Until we learn more about the outcome of each of the above should be practiced in different areas and monitored.
- 9036 Q7: 18) Current and future resources both for me and future generations.
Q8: 5) Suppress fires which endanger human life, property and commodity resource, but allow fire a natural role in wilderness areas. Use controlled fire to protect forest health in conjunction with other management techniques like tree thinning, timber harvest and pesticides.
Q9e) What kind of regulation? Some may be effective and useful. Others may not.
Q11l) Farming practices, example sedimentation from Palouse wheat fields.
Q14) Public decide allocation issue (how much and when) let professional manage the land to achieve the desired amount.
Q24) Both approaches have merit under certain conditions. I do not believe the plan should lock in only ONE approach.
- 9037 Q3i) Can allow grazing and manage for ecosystem protection.
Q4) Chaired BLM advisory committee for E. Oregon.
Q5) Generally in good condition, isolated abuse, better protection of riparian.
Q7) All are important. Can't just pick three, it's a relative issue.
Q10) Degree in biology and Grad. minor in Oceanography.

- Q111) Shad and squawfish.
 Q14) Public is ignorant and too emotional.
 Q22) BLM Advisory Council Chamber.
- 9038 Q6c) I frequently see frazzling damage to wet areas, always see signs of industrial logging- very few unbroken views without some sign of human disturbance and the ones that exist are slated for logging. This interferes with my peace of mind. I'm always afraid another special place is going to be destroyed.
 Q9i) Disease and insect infestation are part of the forest.
 Q23a) This is what you used to say about CC.
 Q24) Disperse management activities through watershed on rotating basis. But set aside large blocks of watershed with no management activities. The most productive timberlands are already in private ownership.
- 9039 Q8) First need prescribed fire to remove overabundance of fuels.
- 9040 Q6c) Logging, grazing.
 Q7: 18) Treaty rights.
 Q24) Management by consensus does not work. Manage under sound scientific principles.
- 9041 Q6c) Jet boat noise.
 Q7: 18) Sustainable ecosystem.
 Q23d) For what purpose? Question is bias against support.
- 9044 Q6c) Grazing.
- 9045 Q111) Predators, eagles, hawks, grizzlies.
- 9046 Q8: 5) Suppress fire in all federal forests managed for timber and use pesticides, prescribed fire and salvage logging to protect forest health.
 Q111) Hatcheries, Urbanization, Industrialization, Loss of Estuarian Habitat [1].
 Q24) Both of 1 and 2 above would be appropriate under certain side specific circumstances.
- 9047 Q24) Harvest timber and use prescribed fire to control fuels, no putting of roads to bed!!!
- 9048 Q3) The law needs to be altered to give more flexibility to landowners while maintaining species integrity not at the expense of species. Some salvage could be allowed and the role of fire suppression should be considered to see if insect

- outbreak scale is truly natural or management related.
 Q23a) I don't know truly how well you can mimic natural disturbance through harvest.
- 9049 Q11) Genetic degradation caused by hatcheries [1].
 Q24) Depends on what a short time of period it is. I lean toward number two with short periods=100 years and long periods 200 years and as a response to this question. Generally, I prefer the "no action" alternative. Blistering roads is generally a good option.
- 9050 Q1a-c) No opinion as stated.
 Q14) In #1 if you remove USFS, BLM from statement, I would choose it.
- 9051 Q8: 3) This presumes there is a lot of forest managed for things other than timber and that forest health is more than timber.
 Q6c) Cows, heavy grazing, scarred land due to sloppy logging.
 Q11b,c,i,k) These are threats but only to runs diminished by other problems.
 Q23a) If this is true give it #1. This presumably means allowing trees to go unharvested for 100's of years to recreate original old growth?
 Q23d) For habitat I assume.
 Q23e) Prefer prescribed.
 Q23f) Oppose use of pesticides.
- 9052 Q5) Problems exist but they can be managed.
 Q8: 5) Fire should be used and controlled by resource professionals. Fire should be an integral part of planning on all public lands.
 Q11) All the listed factors have an affect on salmon. We need to accept that and quit pointing fingers.
 Q12) Let's intelligently decide what realistically can/cannot be done for fish. Just throwing money at the problem will not create more fish. The Exxon Valdez clean-up is an excellent example of what not to do!
 Q14) Who is the public? Tell me that and I'll answer your question.
 Q23a) When appropriate [4].
 Q23e) If meant as a blanket approach [1].
 Q23f) Should be managed to reduce impact.
 Q24) 1 and 2 depend on geology, forest health, location in the fir cycle etc. Not to maintain wildlife present/desired, water present/desired, etc. That is a technical decision that should be banned or desired outcomes/goals.
 Q25) No burning only avoids the inevitable. Just ask the folks in Entiat Valley.
- 9055 Q6c) Crowding.

- Q8) We should use a variety of methods to manage vegetation effectively--fire, logging, grazing etc.
- 9056 Com) Are you using proper statistical analysis in your comments "Eastside Edge" Jul 6 issue entitled "EIS Scoping Meetings Completed."
Q24) Question 1 and 2 are unanswerable...Each watershed should be broken down into smaller watersheds and then managed according to the specific uniqueness of these mini-watersheds. It may take a combination of management tools, rest times, etc.
- 9059 Q24) Neither of these is specific enough to answer. #1 will not necessarily result in more intensive management, it may be more extensive over long periods of time.
- 9058 Q6c) Animals (domestic) defecating in water supply.
Q14) #4 without degrading environment and resources.
- 9060 Q3a) Public lands are a national resource.
Q3g) Survival is not linked to cutting remaining old growth. Proper management of second growth can assure survival.
Q3h) Because of modern transportation and hitch-hiking pests the course is no longer natural.
Q7) 5 and 8 can coexist with 11.
Q11c) Except for Ballard Locks [3].
Q11h) Silt in headwaters.
Q13) Public lands need professional, science based management. Pros should have more discretion on local level to manage watersheds. However, they should be held accountable for their decisions. No hiding behind civil service tenure after a screwup.
Q23c) Uncontrolled access by general public causes problems. Fire litter, too many roads.
Q23g) Appropriate for wilderness areas. Once roads and people are introduced, management is essential.
Q25) Adequate skill/knowledge base hamstrung by politics.
- 9062 Q8: 5) We should suppress fire, when fire will result in an undesirable ecological change, or fire threatens lives and property.
- 9063 Q6c) Grazing and logging.
Q24) See Ochoco Nat. Forest Viable Management Guide-Draft 1994.
- 9064 Q6c) Overgrazing, tree farms and not forests, roads.
Q9e) No more roads.

- Q11) Greed [1].
 Q14) Eliminate greed.
 Q19) American.
- 9066 Q11) Of the large number of salmon smolts that are barged around the dams and released below Bonneville Dam only 4% return to be counted at Bonneville Dam. A 96% mortality in the lower river and ocean indicates first priority should be in that area so the fish can grow and return to the river system. Smolts to barge means that we can hatch fish. Barging the smolts through the upper river system eliminates those influences. Let's shift our attention and efforts to the lower river and ocean where the major immediate problems appear to exist.
 Q24) Management depends on manpower, money and time, available to those who own the land.
 Q26) Both agencies have some very capable people. However, most are not in upper level policy and management positions.
- 9069 Q5) Any resource can be used so without destroying large parcels of land or habitats.
 Q24) Apply tools only in areas where each tool is needed, but otherwise #2 above.
- 9070 Q11) Drawdowns at Granite [1].
- 9072 Q3c) Money is a bad reason to change laws.
 Q3g) Once these forests are gone, that's it. You can cut down trees without touching irgin forests.
 Q3h) It depends on what methods are used, many chemicals may hurt more than help.
 Q5) Of course, just look at the Columbia River with all it's toxins.
 Q7: 18) Preserving plants and wildlife for future generations to enjoy.
 Q13) Private business should have little influence because their main objective is probably money.
- 9075 Q6c) Too many closed roads and locked away lands.
 Q7: 18) Life exists only if we use the earth's resources.
 Q20) You forgot most important industry-mining.
 Q24) Allow multiple use on almost all lands this will disperse the overall pressure.
- 9076 Q24) Use #2 but implement a very restrictive road management program.
- 9079 Com) In many cases it was difficult to give honest answers because question was so designed to give great latitude for misinterpretation of what intended by limited choices available.

- Q24) Questions appear to presume entry for any management purpose disturbs ecological processes. Many activities do not hinder and may best and appropriately be conducted on a continuing basis.
- 9080 Q11) Change in food web and habitat in Columbia because of many reservoirs.
- 9081 Q6c) Wildlife survey trip in Okanagan. Heavy logging/clearcuts and lots of cattle in the woods. It stunk like a stockyard.
 Q11) Clearcuts and roadbuilding failure.
 Q13: 9) Not a policy institution, sorry! Courts enforce laws, they don't make them. I am strongly in favor of courts enforcing enviro laws.
 Q14) Stop letting mining, timber and grazing special interests set policy and trash public lands.
 Q24) Stop managing, ie, roading and cutting actual identified roadless areas. Natural systems do not need human management except to close and rip up roads.
 Q26) This entire process appears to be a thinly veiled ploy to incorporate the opposition to justify policies already determined. Most people want public lands protected period. That's not the message these agencies acknowledge.
- 9082 Q6c) Degradation of environment.
- 9083 Q6c) Radio noises at campgrounds.
- 9087 Q3h) But thin stands, diversify stands to prevent future outbreaks on insects, eg MPB.
 Q9i) But not high-grading-large snags have ecological value too.
 Q14) Encourage volunteer field work.
 Q23a) "Approach" not possible.
 Q23c) Exclude snags cut from natural tree fall.
 Q23e) In wilderness areas, ok; timberlands ok if fire fits prescribed objectives.
 Q23f) In wilderness ok; timberlands thin and diversify stands in outbreak and potential OB areas.
 Q23g) In wilderness ok.
 Note-roadless unprotected timberlands should stay roadless prescribed fire, thin from below could be used.
 Q26) Mostly depends on money from congress [agency ability].
- 9103 Q6c) Inadequate protection of riparian zones on grazing and agricultural lands.
- 9104 Q6c) Crowding: I try to pursue activities in the solitude or only with a small group.

- 9105 Q6c) Crowding, too many people.
- 9106 Q6c) Cows in creek instead of salmon.
 Q11l) Hackwood and Packfield [1].
 Q14) National forests and grasslands should be managed under national public direction.
 Q24) Consider any activity that mimics nature an experimental activity to be conducted on a small portion of total area and only under rigorous scientific scrutiny.
- 9108 Q6c) Crowding.
- 9109 Q3g) The two don't have to be mutually exclusive.
 Q8: 4) Harvest and process burned trees!
 Q13: 10,11) How can anyone have trust in public opinion?
- 9110 Q6c) Limited areas.
- 9112 Q6c) Grazing in a state park and in a wilderness area.
 Q11l) Water pollution by cattle.
 Q14) A well informed public on a national level.
- 9114 Q3g) This is a loaded question: Do you mean economic survival of an outdated industry? It's not simply people vs. trees.
 Q8: 4) Not sure how feasible this is now with limited resources and development.
 Q9a) Depends on who defines "selective" and what form it takes.
 Q9b,c) Feel I need to learn more in depth...
 Q9i) If done based on good science vs economics.
 Q11c,k) Now with dwindling populations of species [2].
 Q11l) Trashing rivers and streams etc. by development and logging too close to riparian areas, run-off of pesticides, erosion from roads and logging.
 Q13: 8) Depends on who is funding research.
 Q14: 4) Could be logistically difficult.
- 9115 Q6c) Grazing, ORV use, visuals marred by clearcuts.
 Q24) Add more monitoring [2].
- 9116 Q9b) I think this depends on insect and prognosis as to spread.
 Q9e) Vehicles not allowed, only backoacking, yes!
 Q23) I didn't know enough about this to answer.
- 9117 Com) By the way, someone ought to look the words " ecosystem Management" up

in the dictionary. This is nothing new. Humans have been doing this since they first lit fires and shot arrows. We have also continued to destroy ecosystems. I suspect as "fad." A hopeless one.

Q1e) Who created idea of rights. Most important, humans evolved to this point in time in relationship to numerous other organisms, consequently these organisms are probably important in continued survival.

Q2) Reductionist approach, again!

Q3) You cannot talk about the use of tools without understanding the goals!

Q3a) Quality of life first, production to create this next, sustaining ecosystem to support this.

Q3b-d) Don't like concept of protection.

Q3g) It is not either/or! It's both!

Q3h) Depends entirely upon goals.

Q3i) Depends on goals-most of this is a discussion of preference of tools. Without a holistic goal, how do you do what's right? Fire can burn my house down, or, warm me, what are goals?

Q6c) Crowding, noise. I was sailing others were jet skiing.

Q7) What are the goals? Based on my goals.[1,8,17].

Q9) What are goals?

Q11) All interconnected. First define holistic goals, assess current conditions relative to goals, test possible tools to move towards current goal, implement and monitor if successful, replan if necessary.

Q14) Recommendation-abolish endangered species Act. It will fail species as society! Focusing on a species will surely lead us to failure, even for the salmon. Look at the whole, including succession, whole ecosystem.

Q23) Need education first building quality in versus regulate it in, common goals important. Again depends on goals. Live in a disturbance type ecosystem, rest is unnatural.

Q24) Depends on goal. For diversity, I support both concepts.

Q25) I am living in the smoke shadow on the Entiat fire now-1 week thick smoke.

Q26) They use decision making model which has not, and will continue not to work-the reductionist model. Their intents are god their ability (as demonstrated) are poor.

9118 Q14) Assuming a well informed, non-corporate public [3].

9119 Q11) Livestock grazing [3].

9120 Q3g) Not a fair question-both are important.

9121 Q8) Poor choices.

- Q8: 5) A managed program of prescribed fire based on objectives for all public lands.
 Q11b) Is factor in population dynamics?
 Q11l) Genetic mixing of stocks.
 Q23) This is nonsense.
- 9123 Q6c) All the damn forest service signs.
 Q9e) Not restrictions on road borders!
- 9124 Q3h) Targeted harvests can help.
 Q11g) If done properly [3].
 Q11l) Protecting salmon to the detriment of native or non-migrating fish.
 Q13) This section I find most difficult as I have observed so much dishonesty by these systems. They also have such conflicting pals that I have trouble seeing solutions.
 Q26) If professional foresters are allowed to pursue their best thought through decisions or management.
- 9125 Q6c) Roads.
 Q11l)Hatcheries [1].
 Q24) Preserve large areas (eg roadless, old growth) and corridors (riparian) then do #2 on remainder.
- 9126 Q5) There are some that are being fixed. Deteriorating? No.
 Q11k) If managed [3].
 Q11) Habitat management is reactively minor compared to fishing management! Habitat problems are critical only when population reaches critical lows due to predation by fishermen.
 Q13) Is "Trust" the ability to do the job, or confidence that they will do a particular job? Or confidence they will do it well, or confidence they will do it as I want it done?
 Q23a) Like Mt St Helens? This gives one a lot of latitude.
 Q23d) Why would you do this - eco-objective?
 Q23) No, each has a place, none can stand alone and there are many other practices.
 Q24) Some tools and some areas will obviously require a campaign approach, others a sustained approach!
 Q26) Can't answer trust is wrong criteria.
- 9127 Q7: 18) Balance needs of humans to compliment environment.
 Q8: 5) Can't answer this. I've several controlled burns grow into full fledged fires. Not much faith in the USFS.
 Q23) Minimum management except for monitoring areas- watching rather than

dabbling/controlling nature.

- 9128 Q24) Dispersed selective management activities in sensitive and/or critical areas throughout watershed during ecologically favorable times.
- 9130 Q8: 5) Should be used as a management tool.
- 9131 Q6c) Crowding, noise, commercial activities.
- 9132 Q11l) Warm water fish predation, NO2 poisoning with flush [1].
- 9134 Q2) Current problems are being addressed.
Q3i) With multiple use concept.
Q5) There will always be some problems with the amount of people using these lands more and more.
Q6c) Other people being rude.
Q8: 5) We should harvest the timber and allow grazing to control fires and health problems.
Q11f) Without fish ladders.
Q11l) Too many people concentrated along cities on coastline [1].
Q13) I don't have any trust in Bruce Babbitt as a leader.
Q25) Use of thinning and grazing will not pollute the air.
Q26) I have no trust in Bruce Babbitt's motives or abilities.
- 9137 Q3g) Wording is too extreme but it should not be necessary to sacrifice workers and their families in order to preserve old growth forests. They should be given other jobs.
Q3h) What should be avoided is the use of pesticides.
Q6a) ...but not recently because of age.
Q6c) Logging.
Q9a) Only where logging is necessary.
Q23g) Do not use pesticides!
Q23g) Except for wildfires, they should be put out.
- 9138 Q6c) They all do interfere.
Q20) Maybe we all depend on indirectly.
Q3a) ie, Clearcutting mimics fire?-No!
Q23b) If it is done more carefully than it has been done so far!
Q23d) Why?
Q23e,f) In practice I believe it will always be said that adjoining land management values are threatened.

- Q23g) I favor this because 1) I don't believe the forest service and BLM can be trusted to honestly apply other management tools. They will always have a strong bias toward resource extraction. In the past, professional foresters and range managers believed they were managing the land well; now they believe just as strongly in a different approach, but they might be wrong this time too-will we ever know enough?
- Q26) I have much more trust in the abilities and motives of the US Fish and Wildlife Service.
- 9140 Q6c) Cow poop in campgrounds.
- 9141 Q6c) Construction work.
- 9142 Q11l) Government [1]
- 9143 Q6c) Logging.
Q14) Depends on how the public is defined.
- 9144 Q9c) When considered and effective.
Q24: 1) Easier for wildlife to adjust to.
- 9145 Q6c) Campground noise.
Q9f) Don't need more laws and regulations. We need to implement sound management grazing systems.
Q11l) Political bickering [1].
- 9146 Q6c) Crowding.
Q8: 5) Suppress all wildfires by using controlled burns in all federal lands, mimic natural fire history.
Q11l) Politics [1].
Q24) Intensive management over the entire rotation: compliment the natural processes.
- 9147 Q23a) Not as an excuse to harvest timber (ie large clearcuts) small clearcuts OK, selective salvage.
Q23f) Large outbreaks should allow salvage.
Q24) Ensure recovery of damaged ecosystem (ie aquatic) components and then proceed in an ecologically sound manner. While 1) states "longer periods of rest", this policy may change during the rest period and further harm may occur.
- 9148 Q11l) Cumulative effects! 1 or 2 above not the problem, combination of all or most.

- 9149 Q11c) Isolated in some instances.
Q14) Resource professionals provide info to public for review.
Q23b) To pre-settlement ecological fire frequency.
Q23d) There are better ways to kill trees.
Q23f) This hole's big enough for semi-trucks, let outbreaks go regardless.
Q23g) This is not clear! What about logging? Is this no log? Something missing here.
Q24) Mimic whatever occurred naturally pre-settlement.. That was probably a mixture of the two, which can be decided on a site-specific basis.
- 9150 Q14) Provided public is not just local public.
Q23) These all depend on specific site and management objectives. Not all techniques are appropriate everywhere.
Q24) Not sure, would be interested in finding out about what conservation biologists recommend.
Q26) These both vary considerably depending on individuals. Clearly, both agencies have competent, well intentioned staff and some who are neither. The system sometimes inhibits people from doing what is best for the environment.
- 9152 Q6c) Jet boats, logging.
- 9153 Q11l) Commercial bottom fishing [1].
Q14) Thru NEPA.
- 9154 Q9h) This question is not answerable if you think about it.
Q6c) Logging, grazing.
Q8: 5) Use fire to bring back some environments to health.
Q23) This depends if insects are native or non-native. [2] if non-native, [5] if native.
Q24) Either of the above alternatives may be appropriate depending on the watersheds size and problems!
- 9155 Q6c) I purposely choose those areas where I know I won't encounter these things.
Q23) It's difficult to do this because in some areas, such as Eastside old growth Ponderosa Pine forests I would say do some undercutting to reduce fuel load and then prescribed burns. In areas of Doghair growth and lodgepole pine that were caused by fires, let wildfire and insects take over. It depends on the forest area.
Q24: 2) Even with this alternative, I feel the amount of timber that is cut needs to be much less than present levels, and there should be some areas that need to be protected from being cut.
- 9157 Q6c) Overgrazed land always make the trip less enjoyable as the chances of seeing

wildlife are decreased. The same could be said for clear cutting.

9158 Q1a) Gen 1:24-26
Q2) God is control.

9159 Q8: 5) We should clean up these forests so fires will not be catastrophic, then allow fires to burn.
Com) There is one glaring discrepancy in this survey, that is the almost total lack of an economic factor. I strongly believe that management activities that do not at least partially provide some return for their cost cannot be sustained over time. Cost and return has to be part of the equation at least in a broad sense.

9160 Q24) Not enough information-too large an area for a general plan.

9161 Q6c) Crowding, noise, grazing, logging, fire fighting, road construction, jet boat operations, aircraft overflights, ORV activity, horse traffic.
Q8: 5) Humans cannot afford to control all natural processes. Therefore, a combination of 4 and 3 with emphasis on 3, some salvage and pesticides.
Q9h) Naturally occurring.
Q11l) Watered habitat for human domestic use and mining [1].
Q14) Emphasis on 5 should be on healthy, sustainable ecosystem. This requires politically neutral decision making.
Q24) Assuming that this consensus does not compromise the integrity (sustainability, diversity) of the watershed, either way may have positive and negatives that I do not have the understanding to evaluate.

9162 Q6c) Logging encroached on recreational trails and altered landscape and fauna, same with grazing. Noise noticeable was mainly low flying aircraft, although the noise associated with logging occurred too.
Q24) Both are appropriate but in relation to specific locations. Give more credence to frequent "ground pounders" (forestry fieldworkers) and their careful observations than to GIS models. Be sensitive to the locals.

9163 Q24) Possible #1 with full protection of riparian areas and floodplains and limiting slash burning as much as possible utilizing ground fires (low intensity).

9164 Q6c) Riparian grazing, logging.
Q8: 5) Fire should be used more effectively as a management tool and as a recognized element in CRB ecosystems.
Q24) The watershed should be treated as a mosaic in which different areas are managed under different, ecologically appropriate rotational cycles and management

regions. Watersheds are not homogenous and cannot be managed uniformly throughout.

- 9165 Q2) There is a lot of areas where the environment is good and some areas that need work.
- 9166 Q6c) Crowded campground, too many people rafting the river.
- 9167 Q6c) Logging and grazing.
Q11l) Drawdown of reservoir [1].
- 9168 Q14) The community that is directly involved in making policy.
Q19) White homesteading family.
- 9169 Q1d) Maybe it is too late for this.
Q6c) There was no crowding or noise; we need the logging and grazing and they do not interfere either.
Q9b) If the elevation isn't too high.
Q9e) Sometimes, sometimes no.
Q9g) Use common sense!
Q11l) Drawdown of reservoirs destroys much of the spawning areas, has not improved the salmon runs so far, and destroys much of the recreation available on reservoirs and lakes.
Q12) Salmon can be started in 55 gallon containers, see Washington Fish and Wildlife.
- 9170 Q2) Never, None, Poor choice of wording. Some.
Q3b) Eliminate Indian fishing.
Q3g) Not opposites.
Q12) There are other alternatives.
Q19) Not relevant.
Q20) ALL-retail business.
Q23) Volcanic and winds quite often take them all.
Q24) I don't agree with the need for total consensus.
- 9171 Q11l) Bad Science [1].
- 9172 Q6c) Cows and s___ on the trails, logging disrupting trails and scenic beauty.
Q7) For me, #1 will include 2,5,6,8,10.
Q(b,c) In the past this has been used as an excuse to access potential wilderness for timber.

Q9i) Again, if used without other motives.

Com) This is silly survey. You could have gotten the same results by asking 1 question-Do you support wise-use or Sierra Club Policy?

9176 Q1) What is the point of such questions?

Q5) Problems do exist. However the answers need to be cost effective.

Q9d) If there is research that is conclusive, that additional regulation will help ok. But protecting habitat will not be the only answer. Open sea fishing is an important component of this answer. I believe it would be a waste of taxpayer money and our time for any answer that doesn't include open sea fishing.

Q11f) They have altered the spawning area, but it would not be cost effective to remove existing dams. Other issues to me are far more important!!!

Q13: 11,12) Rural opinion=yes, Urban opinion=no. Most of these people have little or no first hand knowledge, people who are directly impacted that live in the effected areas need first consideration. Perhaps on a county by county basis.

Q14) Rural public from impacted areas should be represented by their county commissioners. Then at least there would be some accountability. Which is a real issue when it comes to agency or dept accountability to the effectual counties.

Q17) Irrelevant!!!

Q21) My family lives in a log cabin on a mountain. We live in a beautiful area with only three families within 5 miles.

Q23e) ...and humans or private property.

Q23) Note: This list is incomplete for my personal preference, therefore it is impossible to rank order or prioritize.

Com) I should first mention that I am a graduate student at Oregon State University, pursuing a PhD degree in Wildlife Sciences; therefore you might consider my responses to your questions a potential bias to your study.

Secondly, my views on the topics covered cannot be accurately conveyed on a numeric scale. I believe that you desire my basic personal opinion, so I will try to give it when I can. Since there are no right or wrong answers to these questions, my opinions are founded largely on natural selection theory.

I will attempt to keep the clarification of my views brief.

Q1a) They exist randomly for no use. However, it is natural for humans to think everything exists for humans. A sound evolutionary strategy until recently.

Q1c) Define ethics. If you think you have an obligation, then you do; otherwise you don't.

Q1d) The earth doesn't care. But the survival instinct and our understanding of carrying capacity should make us desire fewer people.

Q1e) Rights only belong to humans(a philosophical impasse).

Q3) As our population grows and we increase the amount of energy required to support our lifestyles, natural resource an abundance and biological diversity will

continue to decline. Federal lands will become more and more our buffer against total depletion of resources and this diversity.

Q3e) Wilderness areas are not crucial. Proper management of all federal lands is. Furthermore, non-management is seldom [referred anymore; since we have done so much to affect systems, we must work to minimize our impacts (eg if fire has been suppressed in areas with fire histories, controlled burns may help return those areas to their original state.

Q3h) If we have caused changes that intensify or reduce insect outbreaks, then we should attempt to correct for these changes. Insect control may be a viable technique, but see "Silent Spring" regarding pesticide use.

Q3 e,g,i) Short-term sacrifice for long-term welfare is good.

Q5) Define problem, then show me a place where there are no serious problems, at least potentially.

Q9f) Raise grazing fees and fence the water!

Q9g,h) OK but only with completely understood -cides, and only for special circumstances, not on a regular basis. Also, only with short-term halfives.

Q11) Most of these factors alone are probably not serious threats, but in conjunction with dams and the other factors, can add to the problem.

Q12) Salmon recovery is important to me, but preservation of subspecies, of each particular run etc, is not. Species are arbitrary designations. Individuals occur on an evolutionary continuum. Protect the habitat and what has adapted enough will live, and what hasn't will die. Extinction is natural (Dams are not, blow them up).

Q13: 10,11) I cannot question someone's opinion on a moral issue, but I can question the logic by which that opinion was reached. I find most people short sighted and lacking in the ability to think altruistically and objectively.

I hope that my responses are useful. If my status would make my in out bias, I hope my responses have at least been entertaining to some small degree.

9177 Q8) Both [3,4] are correct. Many federal forests are used for timber. [4]...and smoke isn't going to be a problem.

Q9g) Unless there are no alternatives.

9178 Q24) All government agencies-federal, state, and local-should follow forest management practices continuously. US Park service does not manage (any?) park service lands, thus, disease, bugs and noxious weeds are in a sense disasters waiting to happen. Overgrown forests are fire hazards to private lands as well!

9179 Q23b) If done properly.

9180 Q8: 5) We should suppress fire but protect private property.

Q6c) Area packed with people.

- Q11l) Government mis-management due to bureaucracy.
- 9181 Q6c) Wind, dust, noise.
- 9182 Q6c) Logging practices and irrigation equipment.
Q9d) Enforcement.
Q14: 4) ...and processes for making decisions.
- 9183 Q6c) Crowding.
- 9184 Com) It's just the activists creating all this damn ruckus. We feel they are lazy doped up bums, living on welfare and grants.
- 9185 Com) So-called "environmentalists" are adding to the problem by timber-sale appeals, using the End. Species Act as a tool to lock-up more land. Public lands need care and nurturing!
Please Note: The Report of National Commission Wildfire Disasters has excellent study results and suggestions on public lands management.
Q3a) Read the old laws! Forests were to be used for the benefit of people of all else!
Q3) Today's reforestation eventually becomes "old-growth" forest. Some old growth, if vigorous, should be preserved, but when dead and dying it should be harvested and used no matter where it is!
Q5) Forests must be returned to a healthy and growing condition.
Q6a) Residence is within the area.
Q6) Some forest scenery is not very pleasant, disease and insect infested, overgrown, too thick, stagnant growth and fueled up and ready to burn!
Q7) Sustained yield timber management-tree farming. Forest health is #1, multiple use is #2.
Q8: 5) We should suppress fires until the time that fuel-loading is reduced so that fire will clean-up but not kill the trees.
Q9b) Then replant!
Q9d) Not until the forest health is restored.
Q9e) If necessary, only determined by exact science.
Q9) Too much set aside already which cannot be maintained in a healthy condition! How long will it be before (without management for healthy forests) wildlife cannot survive?
Q9f) Not increase or decrease, how about common sense grazing regs?
Q9g-i) If it will help! Proper tree spacing will cut down on insects and disease!
Q11b) Not proven yet.
Q11j,k) When numbers are low.

Q11f) Dams have been in place a long time. What I've read on barging is encouraging. The new fish egg incubators (\$365 each) could be used to introduce more salmon. This would help to pinpoint poor return causes.

Q12) At least equal consideration [4]. If salmon fail or continue to decrease then [7].

Q13) USFS and WS-The nonsense rules especially the way the End. Species Act is being used to shut down large blocks of public lands. Environmental extremist organizations use half truths and scare tactics! No true regard for wildlife or human concerns or the US economy! ! and 2-If they are allowed to practice good forest health and multiple use policies. They have become so tied up by the ESA, Environmental Organizations etc, that they can't perform.

Q17) Much self-improvement study and an inquiring mind.

Q22) Multi-use and common sense.

Q23b) Not until fuel loads are reduced.

Q23d) Salvage for economic value.

Q23f,g) NO!

Q23) Can't number remaining four options-they are all unacceptable options!

Q24) Keep an eye on economics! Salvage any material that can be utilized.

Q25) Fuel loading reduced first. Salvageable materials removed first!

Q26) The ability is there, but need to develop sound sure, forest health plan and then have the strength to carry it out!

9186 Q1d) Bad question!

Q8: 5) We should make an effort to suppress all fires in federal forests along with use of pesticides and or salvage logging where needed.

Com) This is a poor map unless one understands what they are looking at. Your state boundaries and assessment area lines look the same.

9187 I have two questions. #1 on front page you say this survey is conducted by USDA Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management and US Fish and Wildlife. All four of these agencies are government controlled and do not take common sense as an order. #2 Why don't you let people that live in these communities have a chance for a say at your meetings. These agencies do not normally do as these questionnaires request.

9188 Q1e) This is a loaded question. Are we talking rights by law. If so do we write laws and have more attorney and courts protect who or what. This question should be thrown out.

Q3g) Needs to be a compromise.

9192 Q8: 5) The clean air act doesn't encourage the use of fire.

Q24) Manage the watershed all of the time. Harvest the timber no faster than it is regenerated. Don't overgraze the grass. Use techniques like chemicals to enhance

your management.

Q25) If Ag. can't burn why should the Forest Service be able to burn.

9194 Q8:5) There are too many fuels currently on federal forests to allow wildfires. Management practices must change and reintroduce fire slowly as a management tool.

Q9) Replanting trees and grasses must be included.

COM) It is my feeling and the feeling of many others that the USFS' motive is to remove all cattle from federal lands no matter what. Cattle are an excellent management tool as shown by many studies, including the Starkey Experiment Station. Cattle are also an important commodity of the United States.

The environmental groups have gotten to the USFS and have brain washed them into believing that the cattle industry has degraded the federal lands. All federal land users must take blame and responsibility for the condition of the land and work together for improvements.

Public land means just that, public. It is not land chosen and set aside for the enjoyment of preservationists. God created plants and animals for the enjoyment and use of ALL mankind.

9196 Q1b) with wisdom

Q2) The best interests of mankind will be served in the long run, by protecting the environment, including plant and animal species.

Q8) Suppress fire, but thin the trees to maintain the forest health and vigor.

Q9a) [strongly support] as long as best trees are saved.

i) [strongly oppose] if it means getting rid of fir.

[strongly support] if it means cutting weak and deformed or too crowded trees.

Q23) [Mimic natural disturbances] this probably means clearcutting.

[Allow non-commercial firewood gathering] but should be rules to leave some large snags for wildlife, etc...

[Girdle trees] enough trees should die naturally. Healthy, well-formed trees should not be killed.

Q24:3) More intensive management on most of our public lands on a continual basis, with a few places left unmanaged (in its natural state).

COM) Some questions were very difficult to answer, because I don't know how the proposed solutions would be applied - for instance, "selective harvesting to prevent forest diseases and infestations." Does this mean getting rid of the fir and converting to pine and larch? This has been advocated by some, and I am strongly opposed, because there are many insects and diseases that kill pine and larch too. If it means harvesting the unhealthy and too-crowded trees, then I am in favor. If the Forest Service were to manage its forests more like _____, _____, _____, and _____, I think they would have the support of

many environmentalists and forest products workers, but too many people just dismiss this type of forest management as being too impractical or too expensive, when in the long run, it is really less expensive, because by saving the larger trees, many more board feet per acre per year can be harvested. With uneven-age management, the costs of slash disposal, replanting, poisoning gophers, and herbicides to remove competing vegetation is usually reduced or avoided. It takes 50-70 years for a tree to grow 200 board feet. Thereafter, it gains that much about every 10 years so it doesn't make sense to cut it down as soon as it becomes merchantable. Due to past and present logging practices, such as clearcutting, seed tree, shelterwood, and all-merchantable timber cuts, there are now far fewer large trees than in the past, and some species dependent on old-growth are endangered. Uneven-aged management of our forests, as practiced by some award-winning small woodland owners, would help to restore more old-growth forests and the species depended on them. The streams would be shaded and cool, and water flow would be more even throughout the year.

The only acceptable reason to use prescribed burning would be if it were determined that a species would become extinct unless prescribed fire were used. Prescribed burning could cause more problems than it solves. Because our whole world is also an ecosystem, how will increased burning and fewer trees affect the oxygen-carbon dioxide ratio and perhaps affect "global warming"? Also, many prescribed fires in the past have gotten away and burned much more than intended, and I'm sure that most people in the forest-products industry would rather see our excess trees harvested rather than burned. Thinning, not fire is what we need to remedy the forest health situation. Repeated prescribed burning reduces the fertility of the soil and decreases the ability of the land to produce timber. Many more species thrive in an old-growth forest, than on soils depleted by repeated burning.

Many streams in Northeastern Oregon have good spawning beds. Most fish just don't get through the dams and fishermen downstream.

- 9197 Q7) All of the above
Q111) Sea Lions
Q23) Leave it alone!

- 9198 COM) Enclosed is my completed questionnaire. I would like to have a recap of the results. Dr. Steele, I have serious problems with some of the questions in the EEMP survey, especially since I feel they limit the range of possible responses. Here are some examples:

Q1) Unreasonably limits response range. What about an option that gets at the issue of balance? i.e. "Natural resource management should balance society's need for resource protection with its need for raw materials." The missing option in Q1 is balance.

Q2) Ignores the recent history of public land management in the West, which has improved substantially because of better understanding of ecosystems, better enforcement and tens of thousands fewer animals units on rangeland and riparian areas. Domestic livestock production peaked in 1900-1920. Most large herds were sold to the Army during WWI. Q2 could have used the improvement in ecosystem health as a point of departure. Instead it assumes a negative perception as a point of departure.

Q3) Offers only polarized choices with no balancing opportunities. Respondents can ask for more production or more preservation. Again, the idea of balancing the needs of local communities, the national economy and a healthy, functioning ecosystem is absent. The question of whether people are part of the ecosystem is moot!

Q8) Deals with fire suppression but never surfaces the issue of controlled use of fire to achieve desired future conditions.

The balance of the poll seems fair and reasonable, offering a continuum of responses. I am curious to know why all of the questions do not offer such a continuum, and consider the lack of balancing choices a fatal flaw in the opinion/attitude survey.

9199 Q6c) I would fish for salmon if there were enough to be worth while.
Q11b) Natural periodic event.
Q23) Do whatever is most cost-effective.

9200 Q1) Not really a good survey statement.
Q11k) Depends on how resource is managed.

9201 Q6c) Logging-visual scars within Hells Canyon NRA campground.
Q7) Roadless area protection.
Q24) Allocate certain portions of watershed to preservation, preserve riparian zones. Allow management activities on a portion of the area. Protect roadless areas. Do not apply some form of manipulation to each acre of the watershed.

9202 Q1a) Use here means commodity use and all are harvestable commodities for businesses.

Q7) The wild, growing, unmolested outdoors is a facet of the description of place (Northwest, Oregon) and hence is part (a dominant part) of the character and personality of the Northwest.

Q3g) People are not pawns to be sacrificed for something else. Neither are their lives cast in stone (timber). We must find other livelihoods because the forests have mercilessly overcut. We must work on a holistic scale: stop exports, stop thinking as cutting trees simply as jobs.

Q6c) People concentrate at accessible sites (easy trails) and thereby the solitude and

being part of nature is compromised.

Q23) * Does this "selective cut" of "clearcut" ? I assume "selective".

9203 Q3g) This is not an either or !!

Q6c) Water resource degraded by surrounding land use.

Q8) 4 modified to accommodate a transition of natural fire.

Q13:11) Should shift from having policy guided by public opinion to guidance based on public knowledge.

Q11) We used to have 100,000-250,000 salmon through Rock Island dam. When Indians began using state of the art nets - began seen net marks on steel head and fishing thus dropped off- you cant have runs when you net fish in rivers and at that time all dams in place, when had large fish runs through Wenatchee.

Q12) Once again real problem is over fishing foreign and domestic.

Q16) US west tel. co.

Q22b) Rock hound

9204 Q9h) If they will work and it has been documented.

Q24c) I believe a combination of both of these might work best. It depends on the situation!

Q26) I have trust in the local authorities, but these federal folks worry me a bunch!

9205 Q23:4) Specific locations for wildlife use.

Q23:7) Too long a time scale.

Q24c) Establish priorities for activities that best more toward eco. obj., implement as funding permits, revise yearly.

9206 Q6c) Campgrounds on N.F. overcrowded poor facilities maintenance; deterioration of capital improvements.

9207 Q6c) Both campgrounds were in areas that were heavily logged. Seed trees were blown down creating quite a mess. The areas were almost like being in a Christmas tree farm rather than a forest.

Q24c) Dispense selected management activities throughout watershed be on a time that will allow longer periods of rest between entries.

9208 Q6c) People noise.

Q8e) I do not trust the agencies abilities to use fire as a tool.

Q24c) Site specific/ what is best for that specific area with local input and control.

9209 Q8:5) We should use fire to save all our natural resources, however prescribed fire is a valuable tool to enhance mgt. when applicable.

- Q23:7) This means none of these three are any higher than the bottom of the list.
 Q24c) I prefer an eco system approach that looks at the watershed and the adjacent. Then determine which method of management is most appropriate for different systems. The manager needs to decide the appropriate tool.
- 9210 Q11l) Natural cycles, e.g. drought @ period when stocks are low m. hatchery fish.
 Q6c) Natural ecosystems are almost extinct due to even the best timber harvest practices and cattle grazing!
- 9211 Q2) Not all due to current mgmt. practices.
 Q5) Again wrong lead into this question, current practices?
 Q8:5) We should know which areas to let go and which ones can benefit by simulating vegetation management.
 Q9) The columbian basin is a big place if be it that a 4 more of and less in some areas.
 Q11l) Forest health d&r may be misleading. Not everything is destructive some habitat mgmt. may not harm but benefit especially those that benefit hydrography - water quantity.
 Q12) 1st 5 yrs. 1, 2nd 5 yrs. 3, 3rd 5 yrs. 4.
 Q24c) Balance management for all lands and owners. Not enough acres for federal to do the job, exchange lands, balance timing and objectives for all owners.
- 9212 I greatly appreciate the opportunity to participate in this survey and have responded with comments where I felt them necessary for clarification. I was disappointed, however, that no mention was made of mining on public lands. The need to completely revamp the 1872 mining law is urgent. Probably no other abuse of public lands is so gross.
- 9213 If the USFS, BLM, and WS where doing their job responsibly 40 years ago to the present time the rape of our forests by clearcutting and uncontrolled profit and foreign interests we would not have these problems now in crisis. This also applies to Fish and Wildlife as I can remember in the 40's and 50's when the salmon and steelhead runs numbered in the thousands per day. How do we justify protesting the destruction of S. American rain forests and at the same time rapidly destroying our own Northwest environment?
- 9214 Although my opinions seem to indicate a "throw the rascals out attitude", I am happy to see some bold management decisions being made recently. For example, Hart Mtns long term problem with over grazing has been tackled in a way that pleases me. But other people with different views disagree with that decision. How can everyone win?

I feel everyone wins when decline of habitat for wildlife and especially endangered species is stopped and reversed, though short-term socioeconomic loss may happen. We simply can't stand by while vital parts of our world, our whole earth are allowed to fall out as the salmon apparently is.

Best wishes for you and your project. I hope you get a tremendous response.

9215 I have some concern about this question. It certainly leaves the impression that a greater response leads to more accuracy-and I believe this is methodologically incorrect. I hope the write-up will address this issue.

9216 In evaluating the general decline of salmon runs, researchers have a difficult task because of the many possible conflicting factors. One approach that may be enlightening is to look at the status of salmon in relatively "natural" rivers such as those that drain Olympic National Park. They are not any better than other "less natural" rivers. I believe the principal cause of our salmon disaster is intense over-fishing of a limited resource by many groups; high seas netters, Indian netters, commercial fishermen and sport fishermen. Only drastic reduction in catches by all groups can save the fishery.

An additional comment: Your effort to sample public opinion is useful in gauging what influence this opinion may have on the political decisions that affect the whole area of environmental protection and preservation. I believe that if we take a long view of man's relationship to our planet, we will realize that environmental conservation is in the interest of all citizens, including ranchers and loggers.

9217 I believe a multiple use concept will benefit more people than being a radical environmentalist. Get the most out of the land that will benefit the most people. People have to exist.

9218 I believe most all economic and social considerations are secondary to environmental health balance ecology). But I believe decisions involving land use, especially public land use should be decided largely by the people who live there (especially Native Americans, within their own jurisdiction).

Long term economic stability is rooted in a balanced and healthy ecology. Otherwise, humans are just another herd of locusts sweeping through an area.

Even if reclamation measures are expensive, they must be undertaken. After all, we're planning to be here a long time, aren't we? Think how long Bonneville Dam has been there-and how much longer it will stand. Long term problems need long term solutions. Humans are wonderfully adaptable-we are not an endangered species. We can learn new ways to do things.

Let's be creative, not argumentative. But let's not cry crisis with every challenge.

- 9219 I am greatly concerned that actions often taken to follow a course of action where an uneducated (as to the issue) perception of risk guides.
- 9220 I favor restricting grazing on public lands. However, for those who lose their livelihood and way of life due to stricter regulations, a program should be developed to retrain them, so they can continue to live and work in their home counties.
Some loggers and farmers are 5th generation residents and I believe they will need some help as their way of life is impacted by these changes.
- 9230 I believe in giving God a helping hand-to the best of my ability-to roll up my sleeves and work at keeping my own area (hoping others will do the same) up to snuff. Locking up the world to the eyes and affection of the people who live in it is like putting up a fence after the cows get out. Everyone work (Not Influence Groups) for everyone's good.
- 9231 We would be in better shape today if the DEQ had stayed within the boundaries for which it was created.
- 9232 Question 13. Representatives of local governments should be equal partners with federal and state agencies on any resource issue that will have an impact, either positive or negative, on the local economy or resource base. I believe my county does an excellent job at both protecting it's resources and it's economic viability. If resources need protection, our county finds ways to protect or enhance the resource while at the same time minimizing or even neutralizing any impact to the local economy. Others could learn a great deal from local government especially rural counties and communities. P.S. I am not a county commissioner.
- 9233 Question 22 seems to be stacked! That if you are not a member of one of the organizations that are listed then your against the environment. Nothing could be further from the truth.
I am a farmer-rancher. I depend on the resources and the environment. I also have to take care of these resources if I am to continue to be in my line of business!
The rangelands and the forest lands are healthier now than they were at the turn of the century. We have learned much since then and we continue to improve the rangelands.
To insist that most forestry should be of old growth is asinine. We should be able to go see what virgin forests are but there is also beauty in growing forests.
- 9234 Question 23 should not be a popularity contest!! Each activity described has a legitimate use in a proper time and place. To place a "1" or "2" or whatever beside any one activity precludes using it elsewhere or using another in its place.

What the FS/BLM need to do is establish common sense management goals for eastside forests and charge the regions and individuals forests to meet their goals using the best management techniques available. That includes clearcutting, or no cutting, or prescribed fires or fire suppression, intensive management versus preservation etc.

With all the hysteria and muddled thinking, perhaps it's time to drag out the much unaligned forest plans. It seems to me this did a pretty good job of establishing the framework and scope of activities. Admittedly the outputs and activities matrix have changed but the basic framework is there. I sure as hell hope your management ethic is not dropped through a simple popularity contest such as part 2 of question 23.

The forest service and BLM is densely populated with BS's, MS's and PHD's. You have scientists and practitioners with decades of experience. USE THEM! Put them to work. The "suits" should set the goals:

Goal 1: Gonna have healthy forests...here's the definition.

Goal 2: Key wildlife species are...manage for them.

Goal 3: The fire policy is...make it happen.

Goal 4: Gonna produce "X" timber...See Goal 1 to meet the definition of healthy forest etc.

It shouldn't be rocket science! After the goals are set, then and only then put your technicians to work drawing on a map.

9235 Selective logging is the only practice that makes sense east of the cascades. The USFS has been allowing some clearcutting in this area, probably because the people in DC think the entire northwest is one big rainforest. Clearcuts in the drier mixed forests do not recover well-I could show you a few old ones that never recovered at all.

A century and more ago there was still a great deal of timber, with little dead stuff and no overabundance of brush. Today the reverse is true. Before the country was settled, fires were frequent enough to keep the woods clean and prevent catastrophic fuel levels from building up. They also generated enough heat to kill harmful insects and control infestations without destroying the forests.

I strongly support fire as a management tool, but someone had better clean up the woods a little bit forest. Otherwise the first time some agency attempts a prescribed burn it may set half the country on fire.

The following steps would be logical:

1. Clean up the forests enough to make prescribed burning relatively safe. When this level of controllability exists, the bugs will no longer be a problem.

2. Log selectively and neatly. The timber industry has generated a lot of resentment over the years because it created visible devastation, left a frightful mess behind and replanted nothing. It does a little better now, but it should be required to clean up it's act-on public and private land, because the messes are an addition to

the general problem.

I distrust bureaucracy because, by its very nature, it encourages human error and then compounds the same whenever it occurs. We have to trust it to some extent because it is the only entity that can, I hope, get a handle on the mess it has created.

What has to be done requires an enormous labor force. Whence cometh the help? Maybe we could require prisoners to earn their color TV sets, the illegal aliens their welfare benefits.

Public opinion can't be trusted too far either. Prescribed burning may be doomed from the start by those who already set up an outcry whenever some farmer burns off some stubble, or who find themselves downwind from a feedlot right after they get that place in the country for a real bargain.

- 9236 "All new wealth from the ground"! All wages are dependent on resource production. The economy of a nation cannot survive without strong basic industries. Life cannot exist unless it uses the resources of the earth. Mining is the world's most important industry. You can't make anything without using minerals directly or indirectly.
- 9237 We have a place on the coast. Indians are netting in front of our place. I hate to see expensive salmon caught by them and rich tourists and loggers' kids go hungry. I think we can do better!
- 9238 To see a devastated area caused from over grazing go south of Edwall about 4 miles where Crab Creek crosses the road. At one time not long ago I enjoyed fishing for brook, browns and rainbow but now it's gone. At one time I had fantastic hunting for all birds and deer but that's gone. Irrigation has also taken its toll there as have all the overgrazing.
At one time I trapped for mink, muskrat and beaver, also bobcat but that's all gone too.
_____ owns a ranch there and rents it out to a cattleman who has no love for wildlife. If it could be allowed to grow back to its original state I know all the wildlife would prosper again.
I received the Columbia River Basin Survey on the eastside studies. Many of the questions I found far too complex to for any of the simple answers provided, especially without elaborations. I also wonder about the relevancy of some of the enquiry. I haven't found the time to devote to it, as I don't believe it would be appropriate for me to respond without thought out explanations. Thanks for sending it,
- 9239 Q1c) Intelligent humans should recognize that survival of mankind is linked to survival of all other species, in an equal relationship, not a superior one.
Q1d) Its hard to know since some people are gluttons and others are starving, while

we continue to damage and deplete resources and grow in population size..

Q6b) Most important is being in a natural setting and experiencing a very simple, even if uncomfortable or strenuous lifestyle, for at least a few days at a time.

Q9) Any of the practices I endorse assume that there will be no new roads. Herbicides to control noxious weeds are acceptable, if they are the only alternative.

Q21) I would prefer to live in a community in the Columbia River Basin, compared to any other place I am familiar with.

Q23) Also pruning and thinning of trees and brush before applying fire.

Q25) If I lived near a forest with a high risk of large-scale wildfire, I would not mind decreased air quality, if it meant my community would be safer and the ecosystem healthier.

9240 Q9b) Clearcutting could be used in numerous situations where selective harvesting would not be satisfactory. Eg. Mature stands that need to be regenerated, steep topography and diseased timber.

Q12) Recovery of pacific salmon is an international problem. Commercial fishermen (foreign) and ocean warming are the major factors affecting salmon populations.

Q11) Habitat destruction is not an issue since salmon are not returning to coastal streams that are in national parks (no management).

9241 I would trust the opinions of the public if objective data were available for their consideration. Unfortunately, such data is not available in a balanced way. How can it be, considering the unbalance of the finances available for educating the public.

9242 Q1) I had trouble with this question. For instance question a) I believe plants and animals exist because they evolved and they simply exist as do humans, like the planet neptune exists. Humans utilize them because they can.

b) I have trouble with the word created. It has a religious ring to it, which is fine, but certainly not objective or measurable.

e) Do not believe plants and animals have rights. Humans only have the rights which society decides to give them.

STRONGLY AGREE that our biggest problem is over population and becoming bigger too quickly.

I believe the federal lands have been mismanaged due to limited management, ie timber sales have become too expensive due to appeals system, EIS, etc. Studies have shown the healthiest forests are managed.

I am concerned not only with local economy, but the national economy. Have heard small logging communities referred to as "timber-dependent" communities, when in reality it is the large cities that use most the timber products.

If we do not produce the wood in the US we will end up with a lower standard of living. It will be imported from countries that have never heard of the word ecology,

and wouldn't care if they did since they are too busy trying to feed their people.

If we substitute for wood, it will have to be mined, and will not be ecologically friendly material.

9243 Q1c) This is hard, ETHIC--The discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with duty and moral obligation, Webster's Dictionary. Yes I believe we have an ethical obligation toward animals we share this world with. This in no ways means we are one of the animals. It means we should not use animals in way that would cause them unneeded harm. I don't look at plants as being the same as animals, but as something we use to make our life better.

Q9e) ROAD CLOSURES: I am totally against road closures, this is being used to keep the public out of the forest. Most people have to use their car or truck to see the forest. If you take away this means, and it has been done, most of the people you say you are saving the land for will not be able to see it.

Q13) TRUST: I feel bad about how I had to mark this section. A few years back the BLM and the Forest Service were looked up to in the valley. Now a lot of the good foresters have been forced out and people that do not want use of the forest put in their place. These people believe in letting nature run our land. Old Mother Nature is a tough old girl, if you fall into a lake and you are not prepared, you will drown. This is mother nature, she has no feeling, there is no right or wrong. If I killed and ate a cougar or a cougar killed and ate me it is all the same to mother nature. Man is the only one who can manage this land of ours. This management is done most efficiently at the local level. I do not have any trust in the US Forest Service or the US Fish and Wildlife Service at all. I do have trust in our Congress where things are done in the open with a lot of debate, where all sides of the issue are looked at. Now our government is being run by the President bypassing the Congress, but we are going to change that, the people of this country are very smart and dedicated.

Q14) Congress should set policies and make sure they are followed. The Endangered Species Act is a good case to look at. This act is being used to stop all use of our natural resources because that is what resource professionals want not what our congress wanted when they passed the act.

Thank you for a chance to express my views. I am sure you, and the people running our natural resources know that the people of this country, Okanagan, the people of this state, the people of the country as a whole are getting together to change the way things are being done. It will take a while but the very small amount of people who have had their way while the rest of us have been busy working and paying taxes will be put out.

We as a country cannot survive by locking up one third of our land of the United States. More like eighty tenth of the land of Okanagan County. We do not need, or can we afford, more of our public land set aside for parks. Our forefathers did

not kill off wolves and Grizzlies because they were nice little animals and fun to have around. These animals were removed because they did not fit in with people then nor do they now. We do not need, nor can we afford, these dangers and many unpredictable animals taking up and shutting down any more land in this country.

9244 Q14) This approach to a partial solution is so simple that it is unbelievable that it has not been studied. It does not address the "East of the Cascades" problem. But it certainly could be an enhancement of the downstream from the dams salmon runs.

Artificial flow parallel to the river (or other large stream). This would be accomplished by pumping water from the main river to create an artificial source to the new stream (creek). Salmon smelts would be released into the creek to be the start of a new run. I suspect the electrical power people would be happy to furnish power to the pumps, as a subsidy to the salmon enhancement effort.

These new spawning areas would have to be protected. And somehow, the returning salmon must be protected from Native Americans/and/or anyone else who would not respect common-sense conservation measures.

The confidential aspect of the survey is not a concern to me. I hereby grant right to anyone to quote from these comments...so long as the quote includes the entire comment. I would be glad to receive a response, either positive or negative, to my proposal for your consideration.

9245 This survey is a phoney and is loaded to get the kind of response you desire. It has no validity in fact or otherwise. It is made up just to justify some stupid planned action. You know that people are so gung ho about all of this recreation junk that they will validate anything you want to do in the name of recreation. All of the garbage that has went on this year already proves that. Draining the reservoirs to wash the salmon back to the ocean has cost the northwest dearly in economic terms. We don't have enough water now to provide a sound agriculture harvest. All because a bunch of idiots want to go fishing. They want to catch and release fish. That is pure and outright torture of the fish and for that people are going to possibly lose their farms and homes over it. If any of you had to go out and earn and honest living you would starve to death.

9246 Bureaucratic Feeding Frenzy. I recently attended a meeting on the Eastside Ecosystem Management. I have identified the enemy. He looks like us, talks like us, and feels very strongly that he is doing what we all want. We that don't stand up and shout NO! but HELL NO! at the top of our lungs, are aiding in this attempt to totally socialize all facets of our lives. Our founding fathers wisely realized that private property rights were the corner stone to our freedoms. Can we expect Eastside management to do the same for us as the West side did? Can we expect the animal activists to do for us what they did for Barbara Schoener in Cool, California

(killed by a cougar). I fear we can. Folks, each and every one of us are either part of the problem or part of a solution. Keep in mind we have put our lives on the line for freedom. Do not allow this tyrannical government to take away these freedoms we have fought for over 200 years to have and keep.

Historically 65 million feet of timber have been harvested in the Priest Lake area, this year maybe 2 million, why? Extreme environmental groups appealing for sales and for the first time in the history of the forest service we have a biologist in charge (very cozy with the northern spotted owl) instead of a silviculturalist. What else should we expect from the most inept, morally corrupt administration in the history of this great country?

9247 **DON'T JUST STOP, BACK UP TEN YEARS!** We have not been operating in a vacuum for 200 years. Hire, as we have in the past, experts in the fields of forestry to manage our forests, biologists to be at the staff level only. Totally disregard our illustrious Vice President and the likes of the _____ and _____ of this world. Their views are nothing more than arrogance. Let them put their life savings into several hundred acres and manage it as they see fit. Regulation on public lands will most certainly overlap onto private lands regardless of your best intentions. We the forest owners of private lands have cared for our lands for many years, maintaining good stewardship practices and providing wildlife habitat. Get off our backs!

I would suggest you go back at least ten years and use the regulations and procedures in place at that time. This many require you to reduce your workforce. We the private property owners of this country are getting sick and tired of having to put up with the taxes, regulations and bureaucrats telling us how to live our lives. Socialism has not succeeded in any country and it most surely won't here, regardless of the social Marxist leaning of this most inept, morally corrupt administration in the history of this great country, I am so proud to have served in the Navy.

I have recently answered a letter from the Honorable Senator Sam Nunn. I expressed to him my belief that if our founding fathers were to return they would hang us all for treason for allowing our government to degenerate to the level it has, Social Tyranny!!

9248 I just completed your survey and am compelled to reply. You will find comments noted in the margins and appended to the additional page. Please forgive the quarrelsome nature of my appended comments...let me explain.

The present controversy notwithstanding, BLM and Forest service are premier organizations with a long history of land management. Professional forest and range managers plus a bunch of biologists and other specialists have labored to decipher muddy public policy for two decades. Your questionnaire implies their expertise will be substituted with a form of popularity poll to determine if I the public, like lots of

fire or no fire; lots of wilderness no wilderness; lots of timber harvest or none etc.

I am a second generation professional forester with a wide range of experience and reasonably can make informed decisions on things like prescribed fires. What about the downtown civil engineer who builds buildings? He knows that Smokey has told him for 50 years how bad all fire is. How about the secretary to whom wilderness is the city park? These people have legitimate concerns and you need to hear about those concerns and desires connected with their public lands. But this questionnaire presents management decisions not desired outcomes.

If you mailed this questionnaire to a wide audience you asked them to make decisions or offer opinions they are unqualified to offer...it's like polling people as to the type of chemotherapy that should be used for specific cancers. If you mailed it only to special interest groups, you have missed many people who, as citizens, have a right to voice their interests.

The public has a right to be involved in public land goals. Parenthetically, while a broad range of public input is appropriate, local people, those directly affected by public land policy, should be given a greater measure of emphasis. Agency leaders need to set goals and objectives based on public desires; achieving those objectives ought to be left to professional land managers with help (not veto power) from pertinent scientists.

I would be more than glad to discuss any of the above comments and opinions with you or anyone else. Please contact me if you wish to do so.

9249 Currently there is a lot of talk about the environmental damage that is being caused by the use of renewable resources in the west.

Personally, I do not see the problem. I greatly enjoy hunting deer, bear, and cougar in the northern Okanagan County. I am also an avid creek fishermen along with my wife and two young sons. Every creek we have fished has had logging occur near or in the stream, yet they are full of fish. As long as logs are not skidded up or down the stream channel, there is no destruction of habitat after logging is done to an area, if anything these small fish grow a couple of inches larger and are heavier due to the increased flow in the streams and more abundant food available from the new growth around the streams.

It is my observation that management activities enhance the winter range of mule deer and as a result, the top of the line predators are doing very well. The recent population explosion of cougar in the west is an indication that their entire habitat and food chain is in excellent condition and no where near the total collapse that is promoted by some.

In order for a top of the line predator to expand the entire food chain must be in good health. Management activities allow sunlight to reach the forest floor. This allows brush and forbs to grow that would otherwise be impossible under a closed canopy. This new growth/early succession is the most productive state that the land

can be in for the vast majority of wildlife species that we all enjoy.

The thought that it is ok for the forest to burn uncontrolled is, to me, criminal. We have controlled fire for so long that there is a dangerous amount of fuel build-up. It is to the point that if we were to allow uncontrolled wildfire to burn, it would burn too hot and the future productivity of the forest would be at great risk for generations to come.

Allowing beetle killed lodgepole to fall over and rot is the ultimate waste in a throw away society. These trees can be utilized to the benefit of man and animals, yet our government is listening only to a few people who would have us living in caves with no electricity. If the people of the USA are to continue to enjoy the quality of life that every one is so concerned about, then we must utilize with due care the renewable resources that the good lord has made available to us.

When government land management agencies were created, they were done so to serve the local populous and provide an economic base for the area. Currently, their objective seems to be to promote a narrow preservationist agenda to the detriment of the local people, government and economies.

How can a person who lives in the east, where there is no "public" land have an equal voice in matters that affect a land that they most likely have not even seen, compared to a person who lives, works and recreates in an area all their lives? People in the west have no say at all over people in the east. Yet an easterner can control my livelihood. These easterners do not pay taxes in my area, they do not help pay for my sons primary education nor will they fund my son's college education.

It is not possible for the west to continue economic well-being without the proper sustainable utilization of our vast renewable resources of timber, grass and water.

As an alumnus of WSU, I am glad to see the university involved in something as important as this analysis, hopefully it will add a little trust to and objectivity to a process that to many is highly suspect from the start.

Thank you for the opportunity for input into the decision making process.

9250 As you recall I called you concerning the Columbia River Basin Survey of Natural Resource Issues. This is a follow-up with my comments and concerns about the survey. I have made some comments by individual questions (both in the survey and this letter) and then some general comments about the survey.

Q2) Some problems exist but the real concern should be the magnitude of these problems. Are the problems so severe that plant, animal and human existence is in jeopardy or are the problems localized and manageable. For some, recalling a clear-cut may justify a seven rating, but that individual clear-cut may in fact be benign or even have a positive impact on the local ecosystem.

Q3) Rating each statement begs conflict. For example, any reasonable person would rate item A as a five. But that rating would only be acceptable if all other considerations for the environment are met. It is not only possible, but highly

probable, that these statements are not mutually exclusive. Economics, communities, habitats, endangered species, etc. can exist without over riding conflicts with management. Unfortunately, we focus on conflict versus compatibility. The key is management-including management of humans. Most endangered species are not doomed by forest management, but by physical destruction by humans (hunting, fishing and other deadly forces).

Q5) Same as for question 2.

Q7) The selection of possible resources are not on the same level. Perhaps 1, 8, 9, 10 (or my 18), and 17 can be equal or equivalent responses to the question. These five encompass all the other factors. What do you hope to determine if someone selects reservoir storage and not hydro-electric power or selects both.

Q9) Alternative D may sound good to many respondents, but I doubt they know what you are talking about. Either liking or disliking regulation will elicit a pre-determined answer. Some regulations may be good, others costly but ineffective. It may make us feel good when opting for regulation, particularly if it will not affect us.

It may be that human conflict species (hunting, fishing and other forms of direct destruction) is more of a problem than habitat changes from forest management. To illustrate: On a trip from Spokane to Colville last week I counted three overnight road kills to white tail deer. Each doe probably had one or more fawns that will not survive without their mothers. One could argue that highways are habitat changes, but I doubt the public views it that way or is willing to eliminate the highway system to preserve wildlife.

Q12) This is not a black and white situation, although some level of trade-off is a certainty with fishing and hydro-power generation.

This may be the point to suggest that forest planners not take on the entire burden for salmon problems and their ultimate recovery. Current spawning habitat exceeds available fish to use.

General Comments: The questionnaire often amounts to choosing up sides on resource issues. This is a format of the past. The real effort should focus on what the public really wants or needs when a trade-off is necessary. How much wilderness do you want or need if each acre increases the cost of living by X dollars?

There are also numerous publics. Will an investment banker in New York attach the same importance to an increase in the cost of living as a welfare mother in the ghetto? The investment banker in all likelihood has experienced an outdoor, if not wilderness trip with memories. In contrast, the welfare mother probably never has experienced such a trip, and perhaps never will. The investment banker is more likely to be the activist and voice an opinion. Yet the choice of allocation and management of the resource will impact the welfare mother to a greater degree and she will never respond.

Would the response of interested citizens be different if they understood some basic facts? And would their response be different if the question was posed differently?

For example: It is a fact that forest land in the US, including national forest land, is growing more net timber volume than is being harvested each year. Would citizens respond differently knowing that fact on Questions 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 13, and 26? What if the question was posed differently: The US is growing more net timber volume each year than it is cutting, how do you...

Your survey may be more indicative of how successful the media and interest groups of all persuasions are influencing public opinion. Is this really what public land managers need to know? Or should they be concerned with finding out what the public wants if they have to trade standard of living for an aesthetic experience?

This is a very quick and dirty review of your survey. The Forest Service faces both a challenge and opportunity. It can again become a leading environmental advocate for natural resource management and protection, or accept an early 20th century passive role as custodian. In my judgement, the custodial role is similar to the European civilizations slipping into the dark ages.

9251 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on new management techniques for the Columbia River Basin. Although I very much appreciate your effort, I am concerned that the tone of the questions is rooted in the divisiveness of the past. Most of the questions are worded, unfortunately, in terms of jobs vs. the environment. It is my belief that the cutting edge of land management techniques concerns itself with an honest attempt to mimic the natural historic disturbances (150-500 yrs ago) of a given area, and to harvest, burn, suppress fires, etc. in tune with these understandings. We as a society should stand before large living ecosystems and see what they can provide. We should not stand before them and demand our "needs", for too often, greed and heavy handedness take prominence; and when we allow this to happen, as we are just beginning to see, those destructive acts ultimately become economic costs that are shifted to society as a whole. When we interact with our environment too abusively, economic costs can become socialized while economic gains are granted to a relative few.

Please understand that the Pacific Northwest is at a crossroads where it could become a leader for the world for appropriate, long-term land management techniques. Don't underestimate this, and don't be afraid to embrace a bolder vision for the future.

9252 Q1d) This is an area which is not for me to answer. I am not the Creator! Note: I feel this kind of question attempts to put plants, wildlife, and humans on an equal basis. This is all wrong! There is no question that humans made errors in the balance of nature but much has been learned over the past few decades and for the most part, humans are learning to manage the natural resources for the future of human generations as well as natural selection of species. The destruction of our natural resources happened over hundreds of years and cannot be REGULATED

back into existence in just a few years. Long before man, many species became extinct by natural happenings and for the most part made our world richer.

Q2) Only a fool would not realize we have problems in our rangeland and timber that can be directly controlled by PROPER MANAGEMENT of the agency involved and the industry using the facility. Joint stewardship is the only way that recovery can be achieved and maintained.

Q3g) Loss of old growth forests could be reduced if not eliminated by common sense being used by every person involved. Neither should we reduce the livelihood of the people by closing the forest to harvest.

Q9b,c) This type of question is not acceptable because it rules out common sense. Either/Or type questions do allow the best results. Clear cut might be the best in some areas, whereas selection of timber might be better in another area.

Q11c) Seals do become a threat to our salmon if improperly managed; i.e. the California seals that are a problem at the Ballard Locks in Seattle. We must manage the seal population if we expect steelhead runs to survive. A CHOICE is open to us humans. We can reduce the seal population-note reduce, not eliminate-and allow the steelhead to flourish. We then have the best of both species.

Q11d,e) Education of the people to reduce the destruction of habitat can be achieved with some effort by different agencies involved-without restrictive rules and regulations that totally separate the public from the process.

Surprisingly enough the word environment raises unneeded barriers between people. All people are environmentalists to a degree and everyone should have equal input into our environment and how it should be managed. A person who makes his living from the land is just as knowledgeable as a person who is just starting out in life with a college degree and a passion to save the world. Both have a very positive place in the equation and must be allowed to participate fully in policy implementation. Remember, balance of Nature includes all factions, but sometimes the human factor must prevail if we wish the best results possible.

9253 Enclosed are the surveys I filled out for the EEMP project. The survey was generally well written, but some over-simplification of issues was apparent and probably unavoidable. I have enclosed some comments on the "eastside forest health" problem, especially the bark beetle stand relationships and control measures I am most familiar with, as well as my thoughts on conservation/preservation of east-side forest ecosystems, these were written on the survey as well as separately. My comments are based on available literature and my own research, although I have not included references. I have gone into some detail on subjects touched on in the survey. In many cases (Q-3h), a particular management decision is stated which needs more context. For this statement, the land designation, known costs and benefits, long-term objectives, and the probable extent of natural resource impacts with action/no action would have to be known by the reader to generate an informed

opinion. In question 23, the lack of context required additional comments for my responses to be meaningful. I may be overly critical if the study objective is to generate "gut level" reactions to simplified issues in order to identify the "hot" public concerns.

9254 Q1) I think the statements in this question are way to extreme on either side. Humans are a part of nature and a result of natural processes. There is no reason we cannot live more in harmony with nature instead of totally against it. The conflict between humans and our environment are a result of the way we live and wastefully consume resources. We cannot continue to destroy the only home we have for now, for the sake of personal consumption and corporate profits. We have a moral obligation to future generations of humanity to leave the planet in as good a shape or better than the way it was left to us. It is human greed, avarice and selfishness that produces the conflict between man and nature. There is not really an issue of "rights" between man and nature. We have evolved something called conscience which gives us the ability to determine right from wrong and to see the consequences of our actions. If we are to distinguish ourselves from the "lower" species we must act in a responsible manner and protect the planet and all of its inhabitants. We have been given no special rights to exterminate all other living things on the planet for the sake of progress or personal gain. If the so called "wise-use" groups have their way, we will leave our grandchildren a wasted hulk of a planet with a quality of life not even worth living. I find their goal and means morally reprehensible and besides being anti-nature is also anti-humanity. They believe in doing whatever advances their own selfish, self centered goals and to hell with the planet and the rest of humanity to follow. These people who subscribe to statements a and b should be excluded from the whole process as their only input will be to protect their own self interests and they cannot possibly have any positive contribution on how public lands should be managed for the welfare of all.

Q3g) Human beings are the most intelligent and adaptive species to have inhabited this planet thus far. We can live in deserts of the Kalahari, the frozen Arctic North, or the high mountains of the Himalayas. In this country, we have become extremely mobile and many people now are having to change job careers several times over their working lives. To continually pit the lives of timber workers against saving the few remaining acres of ancient forest ecosystems does nothing. The saving of a few remaining trees only advances by a few years the reality that there are no more ancient forests left to be cut. I see no difference to the workers between having to change jobs and/or move now or change jobs and move in ten years. To say that the survival of people depends on being able to cut some big trees, gives no credit to the intelligence and adaptability of people. There is no survival issue here, only a lifestyle issue. The taxpayers and the government are under no obligation to artificially protect a specific lifestyle in specific locations.

Q6c) We tend to avoid places where the other uses produce the interference or conflicts this question addresses. I do not go places that are over-crowded, are clear-cut, or allow motorized machines on trails. I have been in areas where grazing is damaging stream beds and lake shores. I have been in areas where irresponsible activities by other public land users have negatively impacted my experience. Because so little public land is left in its natural state, we are having an increasing battle over how to use what little is left. This produces the conflicts between hikers, horsemen, trail bikes etc., that wouldn't be so serious if we hadn't clear cut so much to begin with. In effect, we are fighting over the scraps left by previous management practices.

Q11) Any one of the factors has some effect. This salmon problem has been going on for years and we have done nothing to stop it. It cannot be solved, if at all, by fixing one thing. The demise of the Northwest salmon is a cumulative effect of dams, destruction of spawning grounds, factory trawlers, pollution of rivers and streams and a host of other minor causes. We have to start fixing the all the major habitat problems. Trying to stop a few sea lions from feeding at the locks is symptomatic of how bad we have let the problem become. When I grew up out here Elwaco and Westport were big fishing towns and you could go salmon fishing all summer. How come no one cried about protecting the jobs and lives of the salmon charter operators as we slowly put them out of business.

Q26) It is hard to trust the public agencies when they seem to always succumb to the highest pressure. They traditionally have appeared to always have been on the side of extractive resource industries. In effect, the more money and power you have, the more you were able to influence the agencies involved with public lands management. The only time they would do something right was when they were dragged into court and made to follow the laws. Just recently, I have come to learn that a certain ranger was leant a backhoe by a mining company in order to divert a stream so that a water problem would be removed from a proposed mine tailings location. I personally saw the site and understand there is currently an attempt to produce a paper trail of the activity which was clearly illegal. Unfortunately the public has a wide range of goals and objectives and the public agencies cannot make everyone happy. Right now it usually comes down to politics or a sympathetic judge. Until the agencies start doing the "right" things because it is the "right" thing to do, their motives will always be suspect. They must start operating on a higher moral plane than many of the people that make demands on them have. Since I have no confidence this will ever happen, I will always mistrust the public agencies that are accountable to politicians and large corporate forces.

APPENDIX B:
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

**SURVEY OF NATURAL RESOURCE ISSUES IN
THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN**



Dear interested citizen,

The Eastside Ecosystem Management Project is interested in your views about possible policies and management decisions that could affect natural resources in the Columbia River Basin. This study is being conducted by university researchers in cooperation with the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Your participation in this survey is completely **VOLUNTARY**; however, in order to gather a fair impression of how citizens feel about these issues, it is important that as many people as possible respond to the survey. Your answers will be kept **COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL**. *This is the only survey you will be mailed, therefore it is important that it be returned with the enclosed supplemental survey within two weeks of receipt.* All inquiries should be directed to Brent Steel at Washington State University (phone:). If you would like a copy of the results, please include a note with your address and **"COPY OF THE RESULTS REQUESTED"** written on it.

Respectfully,

Brent S. Steel, Ph.D.
Washington State Univ.
1812 E. McLoughlin Blvd.
Vancouver, WA 98663-3597

Stephanie Witt, Ph.D.
Public Affairs
Boise State Univ.
Boise, ID 83702

Bruce Shindler, Ph.D.
Forest Resources
Oregon State Univ.
Corvallis, OR 97331

OMB Approval #0505-0020

DIRECTIONS AND OVERVIEW

This survey contains separate sets of questions about several areas of Natural Resource issues. In each section you will be asked a number of questions concerning each of these specific areas.

Please comment on any question in the survey that you feel deserves additional attention.

YOUR ANSWERS AND COMMENTS ARE STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL THROUGHOUT THIS SURVEY.

SECTION 1

In this first section we would like to ask you some general questions about people and the environment. For each question or statement, please circle the response which most closely represents your view.

Q-1 Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement for each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	-----	Neutral	-----	Strongly Agree
a.Plants and animals exist primarily for human use.	1		2		3
b.Humankind was created to rule over the rest of nature.	1		2		3
c.Humans have an ethical obligation to protect plant and animal species.	1		2		3
d.The earth should have far fewer people on it.	1		2		3
e.Wildlife, plants & humans have equal rights to live and develop on the earth.	1		2		3

Q-2 Recently there has been a lot of talk about whether public lands in the Western United States are deteriorating due to current management practices. Some people feel there are no environmental problems now while others feel that there are problems already. Which view best describes your opinion in this area? (please circle your response)

1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
No environmental problem exists now in the Western U.S.		/	Uncertain			Serious environmental problems already exist in the Western U.S.

SECTION 2

In this second section we would like to ask you some general questions concerning FEDERAL RANGELANDS and FOREST LANDS that are owned by the public and managed by the federal government for multiple purposes. These lands do not include national parks, national monuments or state and local lands.

Q-3 Please indicate your level of disagreement or agreement with the following statements concerning public lands such as federal forest and rangelands. (please circle your responses)

	Strongly Disagree	-----Neutral-----	Strongly Agree		
a. The economic livelihood of local communities should be given the highest priority when making decisions concerning public lands.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Greater protection should be given to fish such as <i>salmon</i> on public lands.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Endangered species laws should be altered to maintain timber and ranching jobs on public lands.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Greater protection should be given to wildlife habitat on public lands.	1	2	3	4	5
e. More wilderness areas should be established on public lands.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Greater efforts should be made to protect rare plant communities on public lands.	1	2	3	4	5
g. Survival of timber workers and their families is more important than preservation of old growth forests.	1	2	3	4	5
h. Insect outbreaks on public lands should be allowed to run their natural course.	1	2	3	4	5
i. Federal rangeland management should emphasize livestock grazing over other uses.	1	2	3	4	5

Q-7 Which **THREE** of the following factors are most important to you and your family concerning the future of public lands in the Columbia River Basin? (please circle three responses)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Quality place to live. | 10. Resources for future generations. |
| 2. Outdoor recreation. | 11. Timber production. |
| 3. Vacation destination. | 12. Livestock grazing. |
| 4. Wilderness. | 13. Commercial fishing. |
| 5. Wild & scenic rivers. | 14. Agriculture. |
| 6. Wildlife habitat. | 15. Reservoir storage. |
| 7. Salmon. | 16. Hydro-electric power. |
| 8. Ecological health. | 17. Economic opportunity. |
| 9. Solitude/spiritual values. | 18. Other _____. |

Q-8 Some people favor the introduction of fire in federal forest lands to control disease, insects, and excessive fuel levels. Others suggest this use of fire is unnecessary and dangerous. Which of the following statements (if any) comes closest to your views? (if uncertain leave blank)

1. We should suppress fire in all federal forests.
2. We should suppress fire in all federal forests managed for timber, and use pesticides or salvage logging if forest health is endangered.
3. We should suppress wildfires in federal forests managed for timber; however, controlled fire may be used to protect forest health.
4. We should suppress wildfires in federal forests only if they threaten human lives or property; otherwise we should allow fire to resume its natural role in forests.
5. Other _____

Q-9 Listed below are various management alternatives that have been suggested as possible strategies for improving the conditions on public lands in the Columbia River Basin. For each one, indicate your level of support or opposition.

	Strongly oppose	Neutral	Strongly support		
a. Selective logging practices.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Clearcutting in burn or insect infested areas.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Selective cutting in burn or insect infested areas.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Increased regulation to protect fish and wildlife habitat.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Road closures in ecologically sensitive areas where recreation occurs.	1	2	3	4	5

Q-9 continued:

	Strongly oppose	1	2	3	4	5	Neutral	Strongly support
f. Increased regulation of livestock grazing.	1	2	3	4	5			
g. Use of chemical insecticides and herbicides.	1	2	3	4	5			
h. Use of organic insecticides and herbicides.	1	2	3	4	5			
i. Selective harvesting to prevent forest diseases and infestations.	1	2	3	4	5			

Q-10 How well informed would you say you are concerning the status of salmon runs in the Pacific Northwest? (circle your response)

Not Informed 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 Very Informed
 /
 Moderately Informed

Q-11 Listed below are a number of factors that have been argued to be related to declining salmon runs in the Columbia River and its tributaries east of the Cascade Mountains. For each factor, please indicate whether you view it as a definite threat, a probable threat, or not a threat to Pacific Salmon runs.

	Definite threat to salmon	Probable threat to salmon	Not a threat to salmon	Don't Know
a. Foreign trawlers & drift nets.	1	2	3	4
b. Ocean warming (El Nino)	1	2	3	4
c. Predators such as seals	1	2	3	4
d. Habitat destruction on public & private forest lands.	1	2	3	4
e. Habitat destruction on public and private rangelands.	1	2	3	4
f. Dams.	1	2	3	4
g. Irrigation.	1	2	3	4
h. Water pollution.	1	2	3	4
i. Native American gill nets.	1	2	3	4
j. Domestic commercial fishing industry.	1	2	3	4
k. Recreation and sports fishing.	1	2	3	4
l. Other _____	1	2	3	4

Q-12 Recovery of Pacific salmon may require difficult trade-offs between restoring natural environmental conditions (spawning habitat, increased river flows) and socioeconomic considerations (employment, recreation, irrigation, hydro-electric power). Where would you locate yourself on the following scale concerning this issues?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

<p>The highest priority should be given to recovery of salmon, even if there are negative socioeconomic consequences.</p>	<p>Salmon recovery and socioeconomic factors should be given equal priority.</p>	<p>The highest priority should be given to socioeconomic considerations, even if there are negative consequences for salmon.</p>
---	--	--

Q-13 In recent years, many organizations and institutions have influenced federal public lands policy. We would like to know how much trust you have in those below that are directly or indirectly involved in managing federal forests and rangelands in the Columbia River Basin. On the left side of the page, circle the number that indicates your trust in their ability to contribute to good public lands management. On the right side, circle the number that indicates the amount of influence these organizations should have in public lands management.

How Much Trust do You Have in the Following:

1. No trust at all
2. Limited trust
3. Uncertain
4. Moderate trust
5. Great deal of trust

How Much Influence Should Each of the Following Have:

1. None at all
2. Limited influence
3. Uncertain
4. Moderate influence
5. A great deal

1	2	3	4	5	1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. U.S.D.A. Forest Service	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. U.S. Congress	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5. Native American Governments	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6. Army Corp of Engineers	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7. Bonneville Power Administration	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8. University Research Scientists	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9. Federal Courts	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10. National Public Opinion	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	11. Western U.S. Public Opinion	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12. Urban communities in the Columbia River Basin	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	13. Rural communities in the Columbia River Basin	1	2	3	4	5

Q-14 In your opinion, what would be a realistic role for the public in federal lands management concerning the Columbia River Basin (please circle one)?

1. None, let resource professionals (USFS, BLM) decide.
2. Provide suggestions and let the resource professionals decide.
3. Serve on advisory boards that review and comment on decisions.
4. Act as a full and equal partner in making management decisions.
5. The public should decide management issues and resource professionals should carry them out.
6. Other: _____

SECTION 4

In order to check the representativeness of our survey results, we need to ask some questions about your background and political orientations. Remember that all responses will be CONFIDENTIAL.

Q-15 Year of birth _____ . Q-16 Sex: 1. Female 2. Male

Q-17 Your highest level of education?

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Some grade school | 5. Some college or trade school |
| 2. Completed grade school | 6. Completed college (B.A., B.S.) |
| 3. Some high school | 7. Some graduate work |
| 4. Completed high school | 8. An advanced degree |

Q-18 On domestic policy issues, would you consider yourself to be:

Very liberal 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 Very conservative
Moderate

Q-19 What race or ethnicity do you consider yourself to be?

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. White | 4. Native American |
| 2. African American | 5. Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 3. Mexican American | 6. Other---> _____ |

Q-20 Do you or any of your immediate family depend upon the timber, ranching, agricultural, hydro-electric, tourism or fishing industry for your economic livelihood?

- | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. No | a. timber | d. fishing | g. tourism/
recreation |
| 2. Yes-----> | b. ranching | e. other agriculture | |
| | c. farming | f. hydro-electric | |

Q-21 Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?: "I would rather live in my community than any other community."

Strongly disagree 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 Strongly agree
/
Uncertain

Q-22 Are you a member of an organization interested in public lands issues such as a recreation, environmental, or wise use group?

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------|
| a. Environmental group membership | 1. No | 2. Yes |
| b. Recreation group membership | 1. No | 2. Yes |
| c. Wise use group membership | 1. No | 2. Yes |

PLEASE ATTACH ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE ABOUT ANY OF THE QUESTIONS OR ISSUES RAISED. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

SUPPLEMENTAL COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN SURVEY

This supplemental survey is enclosed for individuals who have expressed an active interest in the Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project (e.g. attending meetings, writing letters, or contacting agency personnel). It is our belief that you understand the complexity of these resource management issues and we want your opinions about potential solutions. The questions on this sheet assume that a thorough analysis of the area has been jointly conducted by agency personnel and private citizens; now choices need to be made about management activities.

Please consider each set of questions carefully and give your honest responses for the best stewardship of public lands. You are encouraged to attach narrative comments to any aspect of this section. Your participation in this survey is completely VOLUNTARY and your answers will be kept confidential. Please return this supplemental survey and any narrative comments along with your completed survey booklet.

Q-23 As part of the jointly conducted area analysis, a set of land management "tools" were identified that people agreed could accomplish broad scale ecological objectives -- although each tool would require a different amount of time, and thus, would serve personal objectives differently. First, rate the amount of opposition or support you personally would give each "tool" by circling the appropriate number.

Strongly Oppose	-----	Neutral	-----	Strongly Support
--------------------	-------	---------	-------	---------------------

<p>_____ Harvest trees in ways that mimic natural disturbances.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>_____ Use prescribed fire to reduce forest diseases, insects, and excessive fuel levels.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>_____ Allow non-commercial firewood gathering.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>_____ Girdle trees and leave them in place.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>_____ Let wildfires burn without attempting to control them unless they threaten adjoining land management values.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>_____ Let insect outbreaks run their natural course unless they begin to threaten adjoining land management values.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>_____ Do nothing, wait for time and natural processes to accomplish ecological outcomes (this includes wildfire, insects, diseases, etc.).</p>	1	2	3	4	5

Now using the spaces to the left of each statement, go back and rank each one as to your personal preference for each management practice (Begin by placing a "1" to the side of the practice you most prefer, a "2" next to your second preference, etc. until all items have been numbered).

APPENDIX C:
ITEM BY ITEM RESULTS

V2 4

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	4	797	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 797 Missing cases 0

V3 P AND ANIMAL FOR HUMAN USE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	299	37.5	38.2	38.2
DISAGREE	2	104	13.0	13.3	51.5
NEUTRAL	3	105	13.2	13.4	65.0
AGREE	4	125	15.7	16.0	80.9
STRONGLY AGREE	5	149	18.7	19.1	100.0
	9	15	1.9	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 782 Missing cases 15

V4 HUMANKIND TO RULE NATURE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	346	43.4	44.5	44.5
DISAGREE	2	70	8.8	9.0	53.5
NEUTRAL	3	99	12.4	12.7	66.2
AGREE	4	105	13.2	13.5	79.7
STRONGLY AGREE	5	158	19.8	20.3	100.0
	9	19	2.4	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 778 Missing cases 19

V5 HUMAN HAVE ETHICAL OBLIGATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	28	3.5	3.6	3.6
DISAGREE	2	56	7.0	7.2	10.8
NEUTRAL	3	95	11.9	12.2	22.9
AGREE	4	222	27.9	28.4	51.3
STRONGLY AGREE	5	380	47.7	48.7	100.0
	9	16	2.0	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 781 Missing cases 16

V6 EARTH NEEDS LESS PEOPLE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	82	10.3	10.6	10.6
DISAGREE	2	72	9.0	9.3	19.9
NEUTRAL	3	154	19.3	19.9	39.7
AGREE	4	146	18.3	18.8	58.6
STRONGLY AGREE	5	321	40.3	41.4	100.0
	9	22	2.8	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 775 Missing cases 22

V7 EQUAL RIGHTS ON EARTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	178	22.3	23.0	23.0
DISAGREE	2	115	14.4	14.9	37.9
NEUTRAL	3	104	13.0	13.5	51.4
AGREE	4	133	16.7	17.2	68.6
STRONGLY AGREE	5	243	30.5	31.4	100.0
	9	24	3.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 773 Missing cases 24

V8 DEGREE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PBLMS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO ENVIRONMENTAL PBL	1	31	3.9	4.0	4.0
NO ENVIR PBLM EXISTS	2	102	12.8	13.1	17.1
NO ENVIRON PBLM EXIS	3	87	10.9	11.2	28.4
UNCERTAIN IF PBLM EX	4	15	1.9	1.9	30.3
SERIOUS PBLM EXISTS	5	104	13.0	13.4	43.7
SERIOUS PBLM EXISTS	6	140	17.6	18.0	61.7
SERIOUS ENVIRON PBLM	7	297	37.3	38.3	100.0
	9	21	2.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 776 Missing cases 21

V9 ECONOMICS HIGHEST PRIORITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	186	23.3	23.6	23.6
DISAGREE	2	154	19.3	19.5	43.1
NEUTRAL	3	60	7.5	7.6	50.7
AGREE	4	182	22.8	23.1	73.8
STRONGLY AGREE	5	207	26.0	26.2	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V10 GREATER PROTECT TO FISH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	103	12.9	13.0	13.0
DISAGREE	2	154	19.3	19.5	32.5
NEUTRAL	3	105	13.2	13.3	45.8
AGREE	4	145	18.2	18.4	64.2
STRONGLY AGREE	5	283	35.5	35.8	100.0
	9	7	.9	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 790 Missing cases 7

V11 ALTER LAWS TO MAINTAIN TIMBER JOBS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	288	36.1	36.5	36.5
DISAGREE	2	84	10.5	10.7	47.2
NEUTRAL	3	37	4.6	4.7	51.9
AGREE	4	138	17.3	17.5	69.4
STRONGLY AGREE	5	241	30.2	30.6	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V12 GREATER PROTECTION TO WILDLIFE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	107	13.4	13.6	13.6
DISAGREE	2	154	19.3	19.5	33.1
NEUTRAL	3	99	12.4	12.5	45.6
AGREE	4	143	17.9	18.1	63.8
STRONGLY AGREE	5	286	35.9	36.2	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V13 MORE WILDERNESS AREAS IN PUBLIC LANDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	339	42.5	43.0	43.0
DISAGREE	2	68	8.5	8.6	51.6
NEUTRAL	3	81	10.2	10.3	61.9
AGREE	4	92	11.5	11.7	73.5
STRONGLY AGREE	5	209	26.2	26.5	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V14 PROTECT RARE PLANT COMMUN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	147	18.4	18.7	18.7
DISAGREE	2	151	18.9	19.2	37.8
NEUTRAL	3	106	13.3	13.5	51.3
AGREE	4	141	17.7	17.9	69.2
STRONGLY AGREE	5	243	30.5	30.8	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V15 SAVE TIMBER JOBS OVER OLD G

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	229	28.7	29.4	29.4
DISAGREE	2	131	16.4	16.8	46.3
NEUTRAL	3	103	12.9	13.2	59.5
AGREE	4	144	18.1	18.5	78.0
STRONGLY AGREE	5	171	21.5	22.0	100.0
	9	19	2.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 778 Missing cases 19

V16 ALLOW INSECTS TO RUN COURSE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	309	38.8	39.6	39.6
DISAGREE	2	162	20.3	20.8	60.4
NEUTRAL	3	93	11.7	11.9	72.3
AGREE	4	132	16.6	16.9	89.2
STRONGLY AGREE	5	84	10.5	10.8	100.0
	9	17	2.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 780 Missing cases 17

V17 EMPHASIZE LIVESTOCK ON RANGELAND

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	324	40.7	41.2	41.2
DISAGREE	2	137	17.2	17.4	58.7
NEUTRAL	3	115	14.4	14.6	73.3
AGREE	4	131	16.4	16.7	89.9
STRONGLY AGREE	5	79	9.9	10.1	100.0
	9	11	1.4	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 786 Missing cases 11

V18 INFORMED ABOUT COL BASIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT INFORMED	1	4	.5	.5	.5
VERY LITTLE INFORMED	2	22	2.8	2.8	3.3
MODERATELY INFORMED	3	145	18.2	18.4	21.7
INFORMED	4	296	37.1	37.5	59.2
VERY INFORMED	5	322	40.4	40.8	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V19 ENVIRON PBLMS IN CRB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO ENVIRON PBLM EXIS	1	25	3.1	3.2	3.2
NO PBLM EXISTS IN CR	2	105	13.2	13.4	16.6
NO ENVIRON PBLM EXIS	3	86	10.8	11.0	27.6
UNCERTAIN	4	24	3.0	3.1	30.7
PBLM EXISTS IN CRB	5	123	15.4	15.7	46.4
SERIOUS PBLM EXISTS	6	164	20.6	20.9	67.3
SERIOUS ENVIRON PBLM	7	256	32.1	32.7	100.0
	9	14	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 783 Missing cases 14

V20 FREQ OF VISIT TO CRB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	16	2.0	2.1	2.1
RARELY	2	98	12.3	12.6	14.7
OCCASIONALLY	3	232	29.1	29.9	44.5
SOMEWHAT FREQUENTLY	4	244	30.6	31.4	75.9
VERY FREQUENTLY	5	187	23.5	24.1	100.0
	9	20	2.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 777 Missing cases 20

V21 BEING WITH OTHERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	287	36.0	38.8	38.8
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	2	124	15.6	16.8	55.6
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3	164	20.6	22.2	77.8
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	4	86	10.8	11.6	89.4
VERY IMPORTANT	5	78	9.8	10.6	100.0
	9	58	7.3	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 739 Missing cases 58

V22 LEARNING ABOUT NATURE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	80	10.0	10.7	10.7
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	2	97	12.2	13.0	23.7
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3	182	22.8	24.3	48.0
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	4	198	24.8	26.5	74.5
VERY IMPORTANT	5	191	24.0	25.5	100.0
	9	49	6.1	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 748 Missing cases 49

V23 VIEWING SCENERY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	23	2.9	3.0	3.0
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	2	22	2.8	2.9	6.0
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3	138	17.3	18.3	24.2
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	4	258	32.4	34.2	58.4
VERY IMPORTANT	5	314	39.4	41.6	100.0
	9	42	5.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases		755			
Missing cases		42			

V24 PHYSICAL FITNESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	113	14.2	15.2	15.2
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	2	113	14.2	15.2	30.5
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3	238	29.9	32.1	62.5
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	4	177	22.2	23.9	86.4
VERY IMPORTANT	5	101	12.7	13.6	100.0
	9	55	6.9	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases		742			
Missing cases		55			

V25 EXCITEMENT AND ADVENTURE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	83	10.4	11.1	11.1
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	2	105	13.2	14.1	25.2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3	194	24.3	26.0	51.2
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	4	223	28.0	29.9	81.1
VERY IMPORTANT	5	141	17.7	18.9	100.0
	9	51	6.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases		746			
Missing cases		51			

V26 ESCAPE FROM NORMAL ROUTINE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	37	4.6	4.9	4.9
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	2	20	2.5	2.6	7.5
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3	102	12.8	13.5	21.0
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	4	239	30.0	31.6	52.6
VERY IMPORTANT	5	359	45.0	47.4	100.0
	9	40	5.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases		757			
Missing cases		40			

V27 GET AWAY FROM OTHERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	61	7.7	8.1	8.1
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	2	72	9.0	9.5	17.6
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3	141	17.7	18.7	36.3
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	4	234	29.4	31.0	67.3
VERY IMPORTANT	5	247	31.0	32.7	100.0
	9	42	5.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 755 Missing cases 42

V28 OTHER USES INTERFERE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	315	39.5	41.3	41.3
NO	2	422	52.9	55.4	96.7
DONT REMEMBER	3	25	3.1	3.3	100.0
	9	35	4.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 762 Missing cases 35

V29 QUALITY PLACE TO LIVE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	450	56.5	57.0	57.0
CIRCLED	1	339	42.5	43.0	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V30 OUTDOOR RECREATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	658	82.6	83.4	83.4
CIRCLED	1	131	16.4	16.6	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V31 VACATION DESTINATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	772	96.9	97.8	97.8
CIRCLED	1	17	2.1	2.2	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V32 WILDERNESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	670	84.1	84.9	84.9
CIRCLED	1	119	14.9	15.1	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V33 WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	740	92.8	93.8	93.8
CIRCLED	1	49	6.1	6.2	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V34 WILDLIFE HABITAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	613	76.9	77.7	77.7
CIRCLED	1	176	22.1	22.3	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V35 SALMON

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	724	90.8	91.8	91.8
CIRCLED	1	65	8.2	8.2	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V36 ECOLOGICAL HEALTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	436	54.7	55.3	55.3
CIRCLED	1	353	44.3	44.7	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V37 SOLITUDE/SPIRITUAL VALUES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	704	88.3	89.2	89.2
CIRCLED	1	85	10.7	10.8	100.0
	9	8	1.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 789 Missing cases 8

V38 RESOURCES FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	406	50.9	51.5	51.5
CIRCLED	1	382	47.9	48.5	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V39 TIMBER PRODUCTION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	592	74.3	75.1	75.1
CIRCLED	1	196	24.6	24.9	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V40 LIVESTOCK GRAZING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	693	87.0	87.9	87.9
CIRCLED	1	95	11.9	12.1	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V41 COMMERCIAL FISHING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	784	98.4	99.5	99.5
CIRCLED	1	4	.5	.5	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V42 AGRICULTURE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	672	84.3	85.3	85.3
CIRCLED	1	116	14.6	14.7	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V43 RESERVOIR STORAGE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	762	95.6	96.7	96.7
CIRCLED	1	26	3.3	3.3	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V44 HYDRO ELECTRIC POWER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	709	89.0	90.0	90.0
CIRCLED	1	79	9.9	10.0	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V45 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	657	82.4	83.4	83.4
CIRCLED	1	131	16.4	16.6	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V46 OTHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT CIRCLED	0	748	93.9	94.9	94.9
CIRCLED	1	40	5.0	5.1	100.0
	9	9	1.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 788 Missing cases 9

V47 INTRODUCE FIRE IN FEDERAL FORESTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SUPPRESS FIRE IN ALL	1	6	.8	.8	.8
SUPPRESS FIRE AND US	2	120	15.1	16.3	17.1
SUPPRESS WILDFIRES U	3	292	36.6	39.7	56.9
ALLOW WILDFIRES	4	211	26.5	28.7	85.6
OTHER	5	106	13.3	14.4	100.0
	9	62	7.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 735 Missing cases 62

V48 SELECTIVE LOGGING PRACTICES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	23	2.9	3.0	3.0
OPPOSE	2	37	4.6	4.8	7.7
NEUTRAL	3	68	8.5	8.7	16.5
SUPPORT	4	193	24.2	24.8	41.3
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	457	57.3	58.7	100.0
	9	19	2.4	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 778 Missing cases 19

V49 CLEARCUTTING IN BURN AREAS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	222	27.9	28.7	28.7
OPPOSE	2	118	14.8	15.2	43.9
NEUTRAL	3	89	11.2	11.5	55.4
SUPPORT	4	128	16.1	16.5	72.0
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	217	27.2	28.0	100.0
	9	23	2.9	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 774 Missing cases 23

V50 SELECTIVE CUTTING IN BURN AREAS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	49	6.1	6.4	6.4
OPPOSE	2	69	8.7	9.1	15.5
NEUTRAL	3	121	15.2	15.9	31.4
SUPPORT	4	237	29.7	31.1	62.5
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	285	35.8	37.5	100.0
	9	36	4.5	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 761 Missing cases 36

V51 REGULATION INCREASE PROTECTION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	213	26.7	27.2	27.2
OPPOSE	2	118	14.8	15.1	42.3
NEUTRAL	3	80	10.0	10.2	52.6
SUPPORT	4	102	12.8	13.0	65.6
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	269	33.8	34.4	100.0
	9	15	1.9	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 782 Missing cases 15

V52 ROAD CLOSURE IN SENSITIVE AREAS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	101	12.7	12.9	12.9
OPPOSE	2	100	12.5	12.8	25.7
NEUTRAL	3	86	10.8	11.0	36.7
SUPPORT	4	150	18.8	19.2	55.8
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	346	43.4	44.2	100.0
	9	14	1.8	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 783 Missing cases 14

V53 INCREASE LIVESTOCK REGUL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	161	20.2	20.7	20.7
OPPOSE	2	117	14.7	15.0	35.7
NEUTRAL	3	75	9.4	9.6	45.4
SUPPORT	4	115	14.4	14.8	60.2
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	310	38.9	39.8	100.0
	9	19	2.4	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 778 Missing cases 19

V54 USE CHEMICAL HERBICIDES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	232	29.1	29.7	29.7
OPPOSE	2	119	14.9	15.2	44.9
NEUTRAL	3	132	16.6	16.9	61.8
SUPPORT	4	161	20.2	20.6	82.4
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	138	17.3	17.6	100.0
	9	15	1.9	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 782 Missing cases 15

V55 USE ORGANIC HERBICIDES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	41	5.1	5.3	5.3
OPPOSE	2	88	11.0	11.3	16.6
NEUTRAL	3	186	23.3	24.0	40.6
SUPPORT	4	235	29.5	30.3	70.9
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	226	28.4	29.1	100.0
	9	21	2.6	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 776 Missing cases 21

V56 SELECTIVE HARVEST TO PREVENT DISEASE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	46	5.8	5.9	5.9
OPPOSE	2	64	8.0	8.2	14.2
NEUTRAL	3	67	8.4	8.6	22.8
SUPPORT	4	188	23.6	24.2	47.0
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	412	51.7	53.0	100.0
	9	20	2.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 777 Missing cases 20

V57 INFORMED ABOUT SALMON RUNS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT INFORMED	1	12	1.5	1.5	1.5
SOMEWHAT INFORMED	2	30	3.8	3.8	5.4
MODERATELY INFORMED	3	172	21.6	22.0	27.4
INFORMED	4	285	35.8	36.4	63.8
VERY INFORMED	5	283	35.5	36.2	100.0
	9	15	1.9	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 782 Missing cases 15

V58 FOREIGN TRAWLERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	505	63.4	65.4	65.4
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	222	27.9	28.8	94.2
NOT A THREAT	3	21	2.6	2.7	96.9
DONT KNOW	4	24	3.0	3.1	100.0
	9	25	3.1	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 772 Missing cases 25

V59 OCEAN WARMING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	220	27.6	28.9	28.9
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	287	36.0	37.7	66.5
NOT A THREAT	3	112	14.1	14.7	81.2
DONT KNOW	4	143	17.9	18.8	100.0
	9	35	4.4	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 762 Missing cases 35

V60 PREDATORS SUCH AS SEALS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	276	34.6	36.5	36.5
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	236	29.6	31.2	67.7
NOT A THREAT	3	217	27.2	28.7	96.4
DONT KNOW	4	27	3.4	3.6	100.0
	9	41	5.1	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 756 Missing cases 41

V61 HABITAT DESTRUCTION IN FORESTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	355	44.5	46.8	46.8
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	168	21.1	22.1	68.9
NOT A THREAT	3	207	26.0	27.3	96.2
DONT KNOW	4	29	3.6	3.8	100.0
	9	38	4.8	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 759 Missing cases 38

V62 HABITAT DESTR IN RANGELANDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	335	42.0	43.8	43.8
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	177	22.2	23.2	67.0
NOT A THREAT	3	224	28.1	29.3	96.3
DONT KNOW	4	28	3.5	3.7	100.0
	9	33	4.1	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 764 Missing cases 33

V63 DAMS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	549	68.9	71.4	71.4
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	150	18.8	19.5	90.9
NOT A THREAT	3	55	6.9	7.2	98.0
DONT KNOW	4	15	1.9	2.0	100.0
	9	28	3.5	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 769 Missing cases 28

V64 IRRIGATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	285	35.8	37.5	37.5
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	244	30.6	32.1	69.6
NOT A THREAT	3	199	25.0	26.2	95.8
DONT KNOW	4	32	4.0	4.2	100.0
	9	37	4.6	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 760 Missing cases 37

V65 WATER POLLUTION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	354	44.4	47.1	47.1
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	288	36.1	38.3	85.4
NOT A THREAT	3	82	10.3	10.9	96.3
DONT KNOW	4	28	3.5	3.7	100.0
	9	45	5.6	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 752 Missing cases 45

V66 NATIVE AMERICAN GILL NETS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	264	33.1	34.9	34.9
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	287	36.0	37.9	72.8
NOT A THREAT	3	157	19.7	20.7	93.5
DONT KNOW	4	49	6.1	6.5	100.0
	9	40	5.0	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 757 Missing cases 40

V67 DOMESTIC AND COMMER FISHING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	264	33.1	34.9	34.9
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	287	36.0	37.9	72.8
NOT A THREAT	3	157	19.7	20.7	93.5
DONT KNOW	4	49	6.1	6.5	100.0
	9	40	5.0	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 757 Missing cases 40

V68 RECREATION AND SPORT FISHING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	84	10.5	10.9	10.9
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	280	35.1	36.4	47.3
NOT A THREAT	3	366	45.9	47.5	94.8
DONT KNOW	4	40	5.0	5.2	100.0
	9	27	3.4	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 770 Missing cases 27

V69 OTHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DEF THREAT TO SALMON	1	125	15.7	71.4	71.4
PROB THREAT TO SALMO	2	24	3.0	13.7	85.1
NOT A THREAT	3	12	1.5	6.9	92.0
DONT KNOW	4	14	1.8	8.0	100.0
	9	622	78.0	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 175 Missing cases 622

V70 SALMON RECOVERY VS ECONOMICS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SALM RECOV HIGH PRIO	1	163	20.5	21.3	21.3
3	2	129	16.2	16.8	38.1
	3	66	8.3	8.6	46.7
SALMON RECOV EQUALS	4	134	16.8	17.5	64.1
6	5	120	15.1	15.6	79.8
	6	81	10.2	10.6	90.4
SOCIOECON HIGH PRIOR	7	74	9.3	9.6	100.0
	9	30	3.8	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 767 Missing cases 30

V71 TRUST BLM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	145	18.2	18.7	18.7
LIMITED TRUST	2	329	41.3	42.3	61.0
UNCERTAIN	3	91	11.4	11.7	72.7
MODERATE TRUST	4	182	22.8	23.4	96.1
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	30	3.8	3.9	100.0
	9	20	2.5	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 777 Missing cases 20

V72 TRUST FOREST SERVICE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	133	16.7	17.2	17.2
LIMITED TRUST	2	319	40.0	41.2	58.4
UNCERTAIN	3	82	10.3	10.6	69.0
MODERATE TRUST	4	199	25.0	25.7	94.7
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	41	5.1	5.3	100.0
	9	23	2.9	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 774 Missing cases 23

V73 TRUST FISH AND WILDLIFE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	210	26.3	27.1	27.1
LIMITED TRUST	2	227	28.5	29.3	56.4
UNCERTAIN	3	119	14.9	15.4	71.7
MODERATE TRUST	4	185	23.2	23.9	95.6
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	34	4.3	4.4	100.0
	9	22	2.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 775 Missing cases 22

V74 TRUST CONGRESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	339	42.5	43.9	43.9
LIMITED TRUST	2	301	37.8	39.0	82.9
UNCERTAIN	3	85	10.7	11.0	93.9
MODERATE TRUST	4	40	5.0	5.2	99.1
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	7	.9	.9	100.0
	9	25	3.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 772 Missing cases 25

V75 TRUST NATIVE AMER GOVTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	149	18.7	19.4	19.4
LIMITED TRUST	2	211	26.5	27.4	46.8
UNCERTAIN	3	200	25.1	26.0	72.8
MODERATE TRUST	4	169	21.2	22.0	94.8
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	40	5.0	5.2	100.0
	9	28	3.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 769 Missing cases 28

V76 TRUST ARMY CORPS OF ENGIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	302	37.9	39.1	39.1
LIMITED TRUST	2	262	32.9	33.9	73.0
UNCERTAIN	3	122	15.3	15.8	88.7
MODERATE TRUST	4	74	9.3	9.6	98.3
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	13	1.6	1.7	100.0
	9	24	3.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 773 Missing cases 24

V77 TRUST BPA

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	261	32.7	33.9	33.9
LIMITED TRUST	2	277	34.8	36.0	69.9
UNCERTAIN	3	137	17.2	17.8	87.7
MODERATE TRUST	4	77	9.7	10.0	97.7
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	18	2.3	2.3	100.0
	9	27	3.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 770 Missing cases 27

V78 TRUST UNIV RESEARCHERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	68	8.5	8.9	8.9
LIMITED TRUST	2	139	17.4	18.1	27.0
UNCERTAIN	3	150	18.8	19.6	46.5
MODERATE TRUST	4	298	37.4	38.9	85.4
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	112	14.1	14.6	100.0
	9	30	3.8	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 767 Missing cases 30

V79 TRUST FEDERAL CTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	248	31.1	32.2	32.2
LIMITED TRUST	2	164	20.6	21.3	53.4
UNCERTAIN	3	127	15.9	16.5	69.9
MODERATE TRUST	4	190	23.8	24.6	94.6
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	42	5.3	5.4	100.0
	9	26	3.3	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 771 Missing cases 26

V80 TRUST NATL PUBLIC OPINION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	256	32.1	33.2	33.2
LIMITED TRUST	2	221	27.7	28.7	61.9
UNCERTAIN	3	155	19.4	20.1	82.0
MODERATE TRUST	4	110	13.8	14.3	96.2
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	29	3.6	3.8	100.0
	9	26	3.3	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 771 Missing cases 26

V81 TRUST WESTERN PUB OPINION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	104	13.0	13.5	13.5
LIMITED TRUST	2	234	29.4	30.3	43.8
UNCERTAIN	3	171	21.5	22.2	65.9
MODERATE TRUST	4	198	24.8	25.6	91.6
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	65	8.2	8.4	100.0
	9	25	3.1	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 772 Missing cases 25

V82 TRUST URBAN COMMUN IN CRB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	139	17.4	18.1	18.1
LIMITED TRUST	2	248	31.1	32.2	50.3
UNCERTAIN	3	183	23.0	23.8	74.1
MODERATE TRUST	4	156	19.6	20.3	94.4
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	43	5.4	5.6	100.0
	9	28	3.5	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 769 Missing cases 28

V83 TRUST RURAL IN CRB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	97	12.2	12.6	12.6
LIMITED TRUST	2	167	21.0	21.6	34.2
UNCERTAIN	3	121	15.2	15.7	49.9
MODERATE TRUST	4	193	24.2	25.0	74.9
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	194	24.3	25.1	100.0
	9	25	3.1	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 772 Missing cases 25

V84 INFLUENCE OF BLM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	48	6.0	6.4	6.4
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	240	30.1	31.9	38.2
UNCERTAIN	3	89	11.2	11.8	50.1
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	255	32.0	33.9	83.9
A GREAT DEAL	5	121	15.2	16.1	100.0
	9	44	5.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 753 Missing cases 44

V85 INFLU OF FOREST SERVICE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	38	4.8	5.0	5.0
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	217	27.2	28.8	33.9
UNCERTAIN	3	78	9.8	10.4	44.2
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	273	34.3	36.3	80.5
A GREAT DEAL	5	147	18.4	19.5	100.0
	9	44	5.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 753 Missing cases 44

V86 INFLU OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	90	11.3	11.9	11.9
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	200	25.1	26.5	38.4
UNCERTAIN	3	92	11.5	12.2	50.6
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	240	30.1	31.8	82.4
A GREAT DEAL	5	133	16.7	17.6	100.0
	9	42	5.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 755 Missing cases 42

V87 INFLU OF CONGRESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	152	19.1	20.4	20.4
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	269	33.8	36.1	56.5
UNCERTAIN	3	111	13.9	14.9	71.4
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	153	19.2	20.5	91.9
A GREAT DEAL	5	60	7.5	8.1	100.0
	9	52	6.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 745 Missing cases 52

V88 INFLU OF NATIVE GOVTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	110	13.8	14.7	14.7
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	222	27.9	29.6	44.3
UNCERTAIN	3	140	17.6	18.7	62.9
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	194	24.3	25.9	88.8
A GREAT DEAL	5	84	10.5	11.2	100.0
	9	47	5.9	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 750 Missing cases 47

V89 INFLU OF ARMY CORPS OF ENGIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	238	29.9	31.6	31.6
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	288	36.1	38.3	69.9
UNCERTAIN	3	110	13.8	14.6	84.6
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	96	12.0	12.8	97.3
A GREAT DEAL	5	20	2.5	2.7	100.0
	9	45	5.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 752 Missing cases 45

V90 INFLU OF BPA

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	203	25.5	27.0	27.0
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	316	39.6	42.1	69.1
UNCERTAIN	3	112	14.1	14.9	84.0
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	95	11.9	12.6	96.7
A GREAT DEAL	5	25	3.1	3.3	100.0
	9	46	5.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 751 Missing cases 46

V91 INFLU OF UNIV RESEARCHERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	63	7.9	8.4	8.4
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	153	19.2	20.5	29.0
UNCERTAIN	3	137	17.2	18.4	47.3
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	252	31.6	33.8	81.1
A GREAT DEAL	5	141	17.7	18.9	100.0
	9	51	6.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 746 Missing cases 51

V92 INFLU OF FEDERAL CRTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	210	26.3	28.1	28.1
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	188	23.6	25.2	53.3
UNCERTAIN	3	110	13.8	14.7	68.0
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	163	20.5	21.8	89.8
A GREAT DEAL	5	76	9.5	10.2	100.0
	9	50	6.3	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 747 Missing cases 50

V93 INFLU OF NATL PUB OPINION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	185	23.2	24.7	24.7
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	229	28.7	30.6	55.3
UNCERTAIN	3	122	15.3	16.3	71.7
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	152	19.1	20.3	92.0
A GREAT DEAL	5	60	7.5	8.0	100.0
	9	49	6.1	Missing	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 748 Missing cases 49

V94 INFLU OF WEST PUB OPINION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	56	7.0	7.5	7.5
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	192	24.1	25.6	33.0
UNCERTAIN	3	149	18.7	19.8	52.9
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	252	31.6	33.6	86.4
A GREAT DEAL	5	102	12.8	13.6	100.0
	9	46	5.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 751 Missing cases 46

V95 INFLU OF URBAN IN CRB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	72	9.0	9.6	9.6
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	233	29.2	31.0	40.6
UNCERTAIN	3	149	18.7	19.8	60.5
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	218	27.4	29.0	89.5
A GREAT DEAL	5	79	9.9	10.5	100.0
	9	46	5.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 751 Missing cases 46

V96 INFLU OF RURAL IN CRB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE AT ALL	1	41	5.1	5.4	5.4
LIMITED INFLUENCE	2	144	18.1	19.1	24.6
UNCERTAIN	3	104	13.0	13.8	38.4
MODERATE INFLUENCE	4	223	28.0	29.6	68.0
A GREAT DEAL	5	241	30.2	32.0	100.0
	9	44	5.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 753 Missing cases 44

V97 ROLE OF PUBLIC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE	1	8	1.0	1.1	1.1
PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS	2	128	16.1	16.9	18.0
ADVISORY BOARDS	3	228	28.6	30.1	48.1
FULL AND EQUAL PARTN	4	244	30.6	32.2	80.3
FULL DECISIONMAKING	5	73	9.2	9.6	90.0
OTHER	6	76	9.5	10.0	100.0
	9	40	5.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 757 Missing cases 40

AGE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
25 AND BELOW	1.00	13	1.6	1.7	1.7
26 THROUGH 35	2.00	98	12.3	12.5	14.2
36 THROUGH 45	3.00	227	28.5	29.0	43.2
46 THROUGH 55	4.00	232	29.1	29.7	72.9
56 AND OLDER	5.00	212	26.6	27.1	100.0
.	.	15	1.9	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 782 Missing cases 15

V99 SEX

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FEMALE	1	156	19.6	20.3	20.3
MALE	2	612	76.8	79.7	100.0
.	9	29	3.6	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 768 Missing cases 29

V100 LEVEL OF EDUC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
COMPLETED GRADE SCHO	2	1	.1	.1	.1
SOME HIGH SCHOOL	3	9	1.1	1.1	1.3
COMPLETED HIGH SCHOO	4	43	5.4	5.5	6.7
SOME COLLEGE	5	147	18.4	18.7	25.4
COMPLETED COLLEGE	6	201	25.2	25.6	51.0
SOME GRADUATE WORK	7	135	16.9	17.2	68.2
ADVANCED DEGREE	8	250	31.4	31.8	100.0
	9	11	1.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 786 Missing cases 11

V101 LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY LIBERAL	1	47	5.9	6.1	6.1
LIBERAL	2	156	19.6	20.1	26.2
MODERATE	3	297	37.3	38.3	64.5
CONSERVATIVE	4	209	26.2	27.0	91.5
VERY CONSERVATIVE	5	66	8.3	8.5	100.0
	9	22	2.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 775 Missing cases 22

V102 RACE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
WHITE	1	726	91.1	93.7	93.7
MEXICAN AMERICAN	3	2	.3	.3	93.9
NATIVE AMERICAN	4	12	1.5	1.5	95.5
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISL	5	5	.6	.6	96.1
OTHER	6	30	3.8	3.9	100.0
	9	22	2.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 775 Missing cases 22

V103 DEPEND ON INDUSTRIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO	1	311	39.0	39.6	39.6
YES	2	474	59.5	60.4	100.0
	9	12	1.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 785 Missing cases 12

V104 WHICH INDUSTRIES NO 1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
TIMBER	1	286	35.9	61.8	61.8
RANCHING	2	63	7.9	13.6	75.4
FARMING	3	46	5.8	9.9	85.3
FISHING	4	8	1.0	1.7	87.0
OTHER AGRICULTURE	5	14	1.8	3.0	90.1
HYDRO ELECTRIC	6	8	1.0	1.7	91.8
TOURISM RECREATION	7	38	4.8	8.2	100.0
	9	334	41.9	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 463 Missing cases 334

V105 WHICH INDUSTRIES NO 2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
TIMBER	1	1	.1	.5	.5
RANCHING	2	108	13.6	55.1	55.6
FARMING	3	48	6.0	24.5	80.1
FISHING	4	9	1.1	4.6	84.7
OTHER AGRICULTURE	5	5	.6	2.6	87.2
HYDRO ELECTRIC	6	5	.6	2.6	89.8
TOURISM RECREATION	7	20	2.5	10.2	100.0
	9	601	75.4	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 196 Missing cases 601

V106 NO OF INDUSTRIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	51	6.4	10.0	10.0
ONE	1	267	33.5	52.1	62.1
TWO	2	76	9.5	14.8	77.0
THREE	3	59	7.4	11.5	88.5
FOUR	4	34	4.3	6.6	95.1
FIVE	5	9	1.1	1.8	96.9
SIX	6	5	.6	1.0	97.9
SEVEN	7	11	1.4	2.1	100.0
	9	285	35.8	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 512 Missing cases 285

V107 VALUE COMMUNITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	25	3.1	3.2	3.2
DISAGREE	2	90	11.3	11.5	14.7
UNCERTAIN	3	113	14.2	14.5	29.2
AGREE	4	239	30.0	30.6	59.7
STRONGLY AGREE	5	315	39.5	40.3	100.0
	9	15	1.9	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 782 Missing cases 15

V108 ENVIRON GRP MEMBER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO	1	345	43.3	49.7	49.7
YES	2	349	43.8	50.3	100.0
	9	103	12.9	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 694 Missing cases 103

V109 RECREATION GRP MEMBER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO	1	395	49.6	61.8	61.8
YES	2	244	30.6	38.2	100.0
	9	158	19.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 639 Missing cases 158

V110 WISE USE MEMBER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO	1	419	52.6	62.1	62.1
YES	2	256	32.1	37.9	100.0
	9	122	15.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 675 Missing cases 122

V111 RANK MIMIC DISASTERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ONE	1	264	33.1	46.7	46.7
TWO	2	94	11.8	16.6	63.4
THREE	3	59	7.4	10.4	73.8
FOUR	4	49	6.1	8.7	82.5
FIVE	5	33	4.1	5.8	88.3
SIX	6	25	3.1	4.4	92.7
SEVEN	7	41	5.1	7.3	100.0
	9	232	29.1	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 565 Missing cases 232

V112 RANK FIRE TO REDUCE FORESTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ONE	1	148	18.6	25.8	25.8
TWO	2	193	24.2	33.7	59.5
THREE	3	115	14.4	20.1	79.6
FOUR	4	51	6.4	8.9	88.5
FIVE	5	39	4.9	6.8	95.3
SIX	6	21	2.6	3.7	99.0
SEVEN	7	6	.8	1.0	100.0
	9	224	28.1	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 573 Missing cases 224

V113 RANK NON COMMERC WOOD GATHERING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ONE	1	58	7.3	10.3	10.3
TWO	2	118	14.8	21.0	31.3
THREE	3	149	18.7	26.5	57.7
FOUR	4	82	10.3	14.6	72.3
FIVE	5	61	7.7	10.8	83.1
SIX	6	66	8.3	11.7	94.8
SEVEN	7	29	3.6	5.2	100.0
	9	234	29.4	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 563 Missing cases 234

V114 RANK GIRDLE TREES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ONE	1	9	1.1	1.7	1.7
TWO	2	13	1.6	2.5	4.2
THREE	3	54	6.8	10.3	14.5
FOUR	4	131	16.4	25.0	39.6
FIVE	5	99	12.4	18.9	58.5
SIX	6	102	12.8	19.5	78.0
SEVEN	7	115	14.4	22.0	100.0
	9	274	34.4	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 523 Missing cases 274

V115 RANK ALLOW WILDFIRES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ONE	1	43	5.4	7.7	7.7
TWO	2	88	11.0	15.8	23.6
THREE	3	80	10.0	14.4	37.9
FOUR	4	109	13.7	19.6	57.6
FIVE	5	141	17.7	25.4	82.9
SIX	6	58	7.3	10.4	93.3
SEVEN	7	37	4.6	6.7	100.0
	9	241	30.2	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 556 Missing cases 241

V116 RANK ALLOW INSECT OUTBREAKS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ONE	1	15	1.9	2.7	2.7
TWO	2	69	8.7	12.5	15.2
THREE	3	74	9.3	13.4	28.6
FOUR	4	78	9.8	14.1	42.8
FIVE	5	124	15.6	22.5	65.2
SIX	6	155	19.4	28.1	93.3
SEVEN	7	37	4.6	6.7	100.0
	9	245	30.7	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 552 Missing cases 245

V117 RANK DO NOTHING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ONE	1	74	9.3	13.6	13.6
TWO	2	20	2.5	3.7	17.2
THREE	3	30	3.8	5.5	22.7
FOUR	4	40	5.0	7.3	30.0
FIVE	5	49	6.1	9.0	39.0
SIX	6	69	8.7	12.6	51.6
SEVEN	7	264	33.1	48.4	100.0
	9	251	31.5	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 546 Missing cases 251

V118 SUPPORT HARVEST MIMIC DISASTER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	70	8.8	9.7	9.7
OPPOSE	2	71	8.9	9.9	19.6
NEUTRAL	3	119	14.9	16.5	36.1
SUPPORT	4	202	25.3	28.1	64.2
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	258	32.4	35.8	100.0
	9	77	9.7	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 720 Missing cases 77

V119 SUPPORT FIRE TO REDUCE FOREST DISEASE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	51	6.4	7.0	7.0
OPPOSE	2	71	8.9	9.7	16.6
NEUTRAL	3	77	9.7	10.5	27.1
SUPPORT	4	244	30.6	33.3	60.4
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	290	36.4	39.6	100.0
	9	64	8.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 733 Missing cases 64

V120 SUPPORT NON COMMERCIAL WOOD GATHERING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	14	1.8	1.9	1.9
OPPOSE	2	48	6.0	6.5	8.5
NEUTRAL	3	138	17.3	18.8	27.3
SUPPORT	4	215	27.0	29.3	56.6
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	318	39.9	43.4	100.0
	9	64	8.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 733 Missing cases 64

V121 SUPPORT GIRDLE TREES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	293	36.8	41.4	41.4
OPPOSE	2	116	14.6	16.4	57.8
NEUTRAL	3	182	22.8	25.7	83.5
SUPPORT	4	80	10.0	11.3	94.8
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	37	4.6	5.2	100.0
	9	89	11.2	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	708	Missing cases	89		

V122 SUPPORT ALLOW WILDFIRES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	260	32.6	35.7	35.7
OPPOSE	2	126	15.8	17.3	52.9
NEUTRAL	3	79	9.9	10.8	63.8
SUPPORT	4	152	19.1	20.9	84.6
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	112	14.1	15.4	100.0
	9	68	8.5	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	729	Missing cases	68		

V123 SUPPORT INSECT OUTBREAKS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	313	39.3	42.8	42.8
OPPOSE	2	132	16.6	18.1	60.9
NEUTRAL	3	62	7.8	8.5	69.4
SUPPORT	4	141	17.7	19.3	88.6
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	83	10.4	11.4	100.0
	9	66	8.3	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 731 Missing cases 66

V124 SUPPORT DO NOTHING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY OPPOSE	1	427	53.6	58.3	58.3
OPPOSE	2	107	13.4	14.6	73.0
NEUTRAL	3	51	6.4	7.0	79.9
SUPPORT	4	85	10.7	11.6	91.5
STRONGLY SUPPORT	5	62	7.8	8.5	100.0
	9	65	8.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 732 Missing cases 65

V125 MANAGEMENT TOOLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FULL RANGE ACTIVITIE	1	182	22.8	26.8	26.8
SELECTIVE MGMT ACTIV	2	281	35.3	41.3	68.1
OTHER	3	217	27.2	31.9	100.0
	9	117	14.7	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 680 Missing cases 117

V126 AT YOUR HOME

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY WILLING	1	331	41.5	45.9	45.9
SOMEWHAT WILLING	2	263	33.0	36.5	82.4
NOT VERY WILLING	3	79	9.9	11.0	93.3
NOT WILLING AT ALL	4	48	6.0	6.7	100.0
	9	76	9.5	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 721 Missing cases 76

V127 WHERE YOU GO FOR RECREATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY WILLING	1	378	47.4	52.4	52.4
SOMEWHAT WILLING	2	231	29.0	32.0	84.5
NOT VERY WILLING	3	69	8.7	9.6	94.0
NOT WILLING AT ALL	4	43	5.4	6.0	100.0
	9	76	9.5	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 721 Missing cases 76

V128 TRUST AGENCY ABILITY BLM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	107	13.4	15.1	15.1
LIMITED TRUST	2	257	32.2	36.2	51.3
UNCERTAIN	3	91	11.4	12.8	64.2
MODERATE TRUST	4	201	25.2	28.3	92.5
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	53	6.6	7.5	100.0
	9	88	11.0	Missing	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 709 Missing cases 88

V129 TRUST AGENCY ABILITY USFS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	90	11.3	12.7	12.7
LIMITED TRUST	2	244	30.6	34.3	47.0
UNCERTAIN	3	62	7.8	8.7	55.7
MODERATE TRUST	4	239	30.0	33.6	89.3
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	76	9.5	10.7	100.0
	9	86	10.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 711 Missing cases 86

V130 TRUST AGENCY MOTIVE BLM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	164	20.6	23.3	23.3
LIMITED TRUST	2	267	33.5	37.9	61.2
UNCERTAIN	3	88	11.0	12.5	73.7
MODERATE TRUST	4	151	18.9	21.4	95.2
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	34	4.3	4.8	100.0
	9	93	11.7	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		797	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 704 Missing cases 93

V131 TRUST AGENCY MOTIVE USFS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO TRUST AT ALL	1	155	19.4	22.0	22.0
LIMITED TRUST	2	256	32.1	36.3	58.2
UNCERTAIN	3	77	9.7	10.9	69.1
MODERATE TRUST	4	173	21.7	24.5	93.6
GREAT DEAL OF TRUST	5	45	5.6	6.4	100.0
	9	91	11.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	797	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	706	Missing cases	91		