

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) [Web Page]:
Information NEPA Consultations/Workshops**

**Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society
http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/JSPSS_Outreach.htm**

Draft December 18, 2017

Outline

- I. INTRODUCTION
 - A. “Study Design” Main Focus
 - 1. Purpose Of Study
 - 2. Purposes Not Part of “Study Design”
 - B. NEPA’s Procedural Requirements For JS&PSS Study Design
 - C. Unique Long-Range Impact Study

- II. JUSTICE SYSTEM & PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES STUDY DESIGN: 2015
 - A. Hugo Exploratory Committee’s Web Page
 - B. Hugo Exploratory Committee’s Aspirations For Josephine County’s (JO CO’s) JS&PSS Problem/Issue

- III. MAIN NEPA AUTHORITIES & RESPONSIBILITIES: BLM
 - A. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
 - B. NEPA Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Executive Orders (E.O.)
 - 1. E.O. 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality, signed by President Nixon, March 5, 1970, 35 Federal Register (FR) 4247.
 - 2. E.O. 11991, Relating to Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality, signed by President Carter, May 24, 1977, 42 FR 26967.
 - C. Council on Environmental Quality regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act: 1978.
 - D. Council on Environmental Quality Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act Regulations: 1981
 - E. U.S. Department of the Interior regulations for Implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act
 - F. U.S. Department of the Interior, Departmental Manual
 - G. BLM National Environmental Policy Act Handbook H-1790-1: January 30, 2008

- IV. NEPA’S TWIN AIMS

- V. NEPA’S HARD LOOK & BALD CONCLUSIONS
 - A. Hard Look & Bald Conclusions
 - B. Significant Impacts Methodologies
 - 1. “Analyzing Effects Methodology” & Public Access To ID Team Members
 - 2. Hard Look by EA and EIS ID Teams
 - a) “Shall” Hard Look by EA and EIS ID Teams
 - b) “Shall” Diligent Efforts to Involve the Public by EA and EIS ID
 - c) Significance
 - C. Administrative Law to Facilitate Adaptive Management Change?

- VI. CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT (CI) IN THE NEPA PROCESS
 - A. Pickett West Forest Management Project DOI-BLM-ORWA-M070-2016-0006-EA
 - B. Hugo Exploratory Committee Finding on Public Involvement (PI)/Citizen Involvement (CI)
 - 1. Exploratory Committee Observations About Scoping
 - 2. Public Written Testimony Hugo JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, HNA&HS

- VII. EXAMPLE BLM MDO PUBLIC TESTIMONY COMMENTS, PROTESTS, APPEALS, & LAWSUITS
 - A. Public Comments on NEPA Environmental Documents: EAs, EISs, & FONSI
 - 1. DOI-BLM-ORWA-MO70-0006-2016-EA Pickett West Forest Management Project Environmental Assessment (EA): BLM Medford District Office (MDO) Grants Pass Field Office (GPFO)
 - a) NEPA Citizen Involvement (CI): BLM MDO GPFO Pickett West Forest Management Project Scoping, EA, & Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
 - b) Public Written Testimony Comments
 - 2. Clean Slate Forest Management Project Scoping & EA: BLM MDO GPFO
 - a) NEPA Citizen Involvement (CI): BLM MDO GPFO Clean Slate Forest Management Project Scoping, EA, & Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
 - b) Public Written Testimony Comments
 - 3. Procedural Requirements, Including Evaluation Of Significant Impacts Model, & Recommended Impact Methodology
 - 3a. Hellgate Recreation Area Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Hellgate RAMP/DEIS): BLM MDO Grants Pass Resource Area (GPRA): February 15, 2001 Public Comments
 - 3b. Hellgate Recreation Area Management Plan/Final Hellgate RAMP/FEIS: BLM MDO GPRA: April 29, 2003 Public Comments

4. Scoping Rogue River's Outstandingly Remarkable Values, Other Similar Values & Other River Values: 2014 (Scoping ORVs Paper)
 - B. Protests
 - C. Appeals to USDI's Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA)
 - D. Lawsuits
 1. U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon Medford Division
 - a) February 4, 2014. Owen M. Panner, U.S. District Judge, Order 1:12-cv-1596-CL, In the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon Medford Division
 2. U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
 - a) August 6, 2014. Ninth Circuit Case No. 14-35250. Opening Brief of Appellant DCVNRCA In the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
 - b) October 6, 2014 (90-1-4-13783). Response Brief of Defendant-appellee BLM In the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
 - c) October 6, 2014 (Case No. 14-35250). Response Brief of Defendant-intervenor-appellee Murphy Company In the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
 3. Judgement/Opinion of U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit??
 - E. Methods Of Determining Court Cases Won, Lost, & Settled
 1. Introduction.
 2. The federal government prevails in most NEPA litigation, 3. Methods Of Determining Court Cases Won, Lost, & Settled
 - a) Forest Service Win.
 - b) Forest Service Loss.
 - c) Settlement.
 2. Management and Policy Implications
 3. Discussion
 - F. BLM MDO Statutes & Planning Documents
 1. Statutes
 2. BLM Plans & Handbooks
- VIII. NEPA CONSULTATIONS/WORKSHOPS
- A. Hugo JS&PSS Exploratory Committee's Written Consultations
 - B. Workshops
- IX. NEPA WEB LINKS
- A. U.S. Council on Environmental Quality
 - B. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
 - C. Environment and Natural Resources Division (ENRD), US. Department of Justice (DOJ)
 - D. U.S. Department of the Interior (USDI)
 - E. U.S. Department of the Interior, Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA)
 - F. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, USDI
 - G. U.S. National Park Service
 - H. U.S. Forest Service

- I. U.S. Department of Transportation
 - J. U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)
 - K. National Association of Environmental Professionals (NAEP)
 - L. Association of Environmental Professionals
 - M. Northwest Association of Environmental Professionals
 - N. Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation
 - O. Congressional Research Service
 - P. United States Government Accountability Office
-
- X. DISCLOSURE
-
- XI. ACRONYMS
-
- XII. NEPA REFERENCES