Name	Affliation	Date Received	Comment Code	Summary Main Comments	Pg. #	Categorey of Comment	For/Against Proposed Decision	Against	For	Unclear
(b) (6)	citizen	12/19/13	1-A	· Very concerned about Oregon's environment and waterways but proposed decision doesn't make sense.	1	General-need to improve water quality	Against			
			1-B	· Oregon has met almost all of requirements and water quality/habitats have been improving for past 15 yrs.	1	General-made improvements in water				
	citizen	12/20/13	2-A	· OR legislature is obstructing salmon recovery progress and prevents state agencies from monitoring WQ necessary to support CZARA NPS water quality achievement goals.	1	Monitoring-improvements needed; Salmon-need more protection	Unclear			1
				· Need to include toxic contamination impairment assessment for NPS--can't be done under current political climate.	1	Toxics/Pesticides				
			2-B	Disapproval will hopefully help improve situation in OR and break up political log-jam so toxics can be addressed appropriately.	1	Decision-benefit; Toxics/Pesticides				
	citizen	12/20/13	3-A	· Concerned about 2007 overspray on his property and wants us to consider toxic effects.	1	Forestry-pesticides	Unclear			1
			3-B	· Notes wildlife and fish just starting to come back. Recent testing of old domestic water supply still shows residual effects.	1	Forestry-pesticides				
	citizen	12/20/13	4-A	· Very pleased when heard about proposed decision and pressure we're applying to Oregon to uphold its responsibilites.	1	Decision-benefit	For		1	
			4-B	· Glad fed regulators are recognizing harm logging is doing to water quality	1	Forestry-general				
			4-C	· Oregon needs to prioritize clean water (even for smallest streams) and guard against human-made landslides.	1	Forestry-riparian; landslides; pesticides				
	citizen	12/21/13	5-A	· "Every dollar taken out of this program will decrease this program by that amount."	1	Penalities-negative impacts	Against	1		
			5-B	· "Most coastal streams are running in their natural state and need no assistance. No farming and no more logging."	1	General-made improvements to water quality				
	citizen	12/21/13	6-A	· I concur with the State of Oregon (can provide details if asked).	1	General	Against	1		
	citizen	12/22/13	7-A	· Has witnessed significant changes (improvements) in forest practices since 1960s.	1	Forestry-general	Unclear			1
			7-B	· Proposal to remove abandonned forest rds is foolish…many are stable.	1	Forestry-roads				
			7-C	· Watershed mngt on grand scheme is better approach due to limited funding to address problem and establish priorities.	1	Forestry-general				
	citizen	12/22/13	8-A	· Recognizes there are water quality issues from ag, logging and other sources (kayaked amidst cow patties in OR central coast) but state is making progress.	1	General-need to improve water quality	Against	1		
			8-B	Reducing funding for programs that will help OR tackle wq issues is not the answer.	1	Penalities-negative				
			8-C	· Agrees with Oregonian editorial that applying one-size-fits all approach doesn't work. A tailored approach is needed…one that is underway but just needs more $ to support.	1	General-one-size-fits all				
	citizen	12/25/13	9-A	· Supports proposed decision.	1	Decision	For		1	
			9-B	For too long, has been concerned about landslides, siltation, and clearcuts from forestry and	1	Forestry-landslides, riparian, clear cuts				
			9-C	· Glad fed. Govn't is taking action to w/hold funding.	1	Penalities				
	citizen	12/30/13	11-A	· Oregan should be penalized. Citizens in Oregon do not have healthy, sustainable old-growth forests, and non-polluted streams.	1	Penalities; General-need to improve water quality	for		1	
			11-B	· There is no stormwater mngt for new development and aging/leaking septic systems aren't being fixed.	1	New devel; OSDS				
			11-C	· Need to stop runoff from past logging roads.	1	Forestry-roads				
	citizen	1/5/14	10-A	• NOAA/EPA is holding state to higher standard based on what we've approved for other states (e.g. CA). Either need to approve OR or go back and disapprove other states. Keeping on raising threshold for OR is unfair and costly for state.	1	General-holding to higher standard				
			10-B	· Holding states responsible for all CZARA requirements isn't right…some, like OSDS, are outside state's jurisdiction.	1	General-problems with CZARA				
			10-C	· Too much focus on water quality improvements. Given population/development increase, even maintaining water quality levels at 1990 levels is a success.	1	General-water quality				

			10-D	· The CWA has demonstrated that its needed revisions over the years as evidenced by prior amendents and recommends now is another time to address problems with CZARA.	1	General-problems with CZARA				
			10-E	· CWA recognizes there isn't a one-size-fits-all response to addressing NPS. As such, absurb to place arbitary and capricious temporal and jurisdictional standards on a state.	1	General-one-size-fits all	Against	1		
(b) (6)	citizen	1/7/14	12-A	· Anti-clear cutting (doesn't believe it can be done sustainably); pro sustainable forestry.	1	Forestry-clear cutting	Unclear			
			12-B	· Supports regular maintenace of septic systems.	1	OSDS				1
	citizen	1/16/14	13-A	· Agrees with proposed decision to disapprove OR's program.	1	Decision				
			13-B	· Supportive of 3 key areas where Oregon hasn't met program requirements (forestry--all elements, OSDS, and new devel) and asks us to continue to work with OR to address those issues.	1	riparian; landslides; pesticides; roads				
			13-C	· Notes NPS impacts from Ag must also be addressed.	1	Ag-General	For		1	
			14-A	· Disagrees with proposed decision	1	Decision				
			14-B	· Through experience on watershed assoc and previous position in USFS, believes state and OWEB, SWCDs, watershed groups are doing (and have done) a lot to improve wq	1	General-made improvements in water				
			14-C	· Loosing $4M in federal funding that supports watershed work will be like "throwing the baby out with the bath water."	1	Penalities-negative impacts				
	citizen	1/31/14	14-D	· ODF is working to strengthen forest rules for riparian protection but face political challenges that require thoughtful science to bring along. Maintaining support of forest industry is important for water quality protection and will take longer than Spring 2014.	2	Forestry-riparian; General-need more time	Against	1		
			15-A	· Agrees with proposed decision to disapprove OR's program.	1	Decision				
			15-B	Not clear why public comment is required on the NOAA-F and EPA's (Agencies) analysis as long as their justification or statement of intent to approve or disapprove the program (Proposal) is based solely on pre-established criteria and valid scientific grounds. Overall, I find this to be the case, and further that the technical analysis in the Proposal is generally robust with respect to the issues it examines	1	General-public comment; General-support rationales				
			15-C	· There are no meaningful regulatory assurances in OR's CNP to protect water quality and designated uses.	1	General-fails to meet wqs/uses				
			15-D	· Voluntary measures/promises won't work; clearly enforceable measures, regulatory linkages and management controls are needed. CZARA specifically requires coastal states to have enforceable controls on nonpoint sources of pollution in order to continue to receive federal grant funding.	1	General-voluntary approaches				
			15-E	· Salmon habitat and continued federal species listings show that the salmon resource(s) in Oregon have been and continue to be declining	2	General-salmon; General-fails to meet wqs/uses				
			15-F	· NOAA/EPA need to include in future rationales and consider when evaluting future state submissions: interconnected habitat and water quality factors and legacy issues, beaver management, watershed and riparian factors influencing water quality, novel human chemical contaminants, over-allocation of water, urban runoff from older as well as newer developments, and little consideration given to the importance of maintaining groundwater flow connection(s), and climate changes	2	General-need to consider other issues				
			15-G	Overall NOAA/EPA analyses are correct. There are several major areas of the coastal NPSPC program are in need of significant improvement and/or additional management measures. Some of the areas identified are: measures for forestry, new urban development, and septic/sewer systems (note: the Agencies should broaden the latter to include measures to improve nonpoint source treatment and control of stormwater, urban surface, and road related runoff; similarly the Agencies should include both new and older urban development and infrastructure)	2	OSDS; New Devel; Forestry; General-need to consider other uses				
			15-H	· ODA's poor past and ongoing efforts at regulating agricultural and livestock practices that harm salmon and other biota are not acknowledged in analyses. Missing (suggested additional) measures to adequately protect water quality include: 1) minimum required riparian buffers on commercial agricultural lands (Note: the published literature suggests a buffer width of no less 100 feet, or 30 meters. Buffers wider than 100' might be necessary on low gradient channels that might meander, and adjacent to designated critical habitats for listed species, for example core salmonid spawning and rearing areas); 2) fencing streams and riparian areas to reduce or eliminate trailing, trampling and fecal contamination by livestock; 3) improved permitting, monitoring and relocation of CAFOs, and 4) regulatory provisions (with or without incentives) to promote reestablishment of riparian vegetation in critical habitats and to promote beaver reintroduction in suitable locations.	5	Ag-add MMs				
			15-I	· Need to consider novel chemicals (Rx drugs, BC pills, pain medications and caffeine) impacting wq.	3	General-need to consider				

(b) (6)	citizen	2/20/14	15-J	· Need to consider over allocation of water/withdraws and impacts less water has on increasing pollutant loads, etc.	6	General-need to consider other uses			1	
			15-K	Need to consider the role of beaver and beaver dams in moderating flows and improving water quality in the broadest sense(s) should be included and examined. Measures should be included to cease or scale back beaver eradication efforts, and also to facilitate and promote beaver re-establishment in suitable locations	4	General-need to consider other uses				
			15-L	FPA rules are outdated and need to be revised. In 1996 NMFS has stated key problems with rules and improvements. Most of these issues were affirmed by independent scientific panel.	5	Forestry-general				
			15-M	· Need to consider climate change. Climate stressed organisms can be more sensitive to pollution.	6	General-need to consider other uses	For			
(b) (6)	Lower Nehalem Watershed Council	2/26/14	16-A	· Watershed council does good work.	1	General-voluntary approaches	Against (penalities)			1
			16-B	· Agree that there should be some sort of penality to motivate the state to comply with CZARA, but penalities, as structured, would hurt watershed councils and others on-the ground that are doing the good work and need federal/state funding to continue.	1	Penalities-negative impacts				
			16-D	· Need to taylor puntative impacts to only effect those that should be (not others such as watershed councils)	2	Penalities				
(b) (6)	Clamdiggers Assoc. of Oregon	3/4/14 (w/ follow up on 3/6)	17-A	· Strongly support disapproval to wake up OR govn't to reality of not protecting the environment.	1	Decision; Penalities-benefits	For		1	
				Septic tanks at OR state parks and other locations are discharging sewage to waterways.	1	OSDS				
			17-B	· Towns of Myrtle Pt and Powers release sewage to Coquille when rains and can't harvest shellfish.	1	OSDS				
			17-C	Concerned about superfund contamination impacting shellfish harvest and that DEQ is not enforcing needed actions.	2	Toxics/Superfund				
			17-D	Should have invertebrate species plan in place.	2	General-need to consider other uses				
			21-A	Funding Oregon CZMA should be contingent on having Invertebrate Species Plan in place for fresh and saltwaters	1	General-need to consider other uses				
(b) (6)	Clamdiggers Assoc. of Oregon	3/5/14	18-A	· Funding Oregon CZMA should be contingent on having Invertebrate Species Plan in place that includes improved harvest regulations for shellfish, sewage spill hotline, shellfish monitoring, and ensures contaminants are not raised above normal baseline levels.	2	General-need to consider other uses	For		1	
			18-B	· Concerned about sewage discharges and well as poor forestry pratices (discharge of bark dust/debris into bay) that have caused clam die-offs and made them unharvestable. Sites specific examples.	9	OSDS; Forestry-General				
			18-C	Also concerned that state/EPA do not properly warn people not to eat shellfish due to baterica/toxics.	9	OSDS; Toxics				
			18-D	· Organization has tried to speak with ODFW and ODFW Commission leadership but claims offers to meet/hear their recommendations were not acted on.	throughout	Forestry-General				
(b) (6)	citizen	2/28/14	19-A	· Oyster farmer in Tillamook Bay	1		For		1	
			19-B	· Supports disapproval because OR doesn't have MMs or additional MMs in place to achieve/maintain WQS.	1	Decision				
			19-C	· Cites specific examples of Tillamook Bay beging close to shellfish harvest for 100 days/yr due to ag runoff.	1	Ag-General				
			19-D	There has never been meaningful oversight of Tillamook Dairy Mngt Industry. Voluntary measures aren't working.	1	Ag-General				
			19-E	· Despite many investments in studies from NEP, still a wq problem.	1	General-water quality				
(b) (6)	citizen	1/8/14	20-A	· OR streams are among the cleanest in nation and provide suitable water for aquaculture.	1	General-water quality	Against	1		
			20-B	Additional riparian setbacks would only hurt logging industry and drive up price of lumber.	1	Forestry-riparian				
			20-C	· Coos County has more forestry than any part of Oregon and more salmon.	1	Forestry-general				
			20-D	Watershed councils are doing good work and we don't need additional regulation.	1	Forestry-General; General-made improvements to water quality				
			22-A	· Support disapproval…may be only effective way to get action in state.	1	Decision-benefit				
			22-B	· Oregon doesn't have practices in place to protect streams from polluted runoff. Although state still claimins programs are effective	1	General-fails to meet wqs/uses				

(b) (6)	citizen	3/8/14	22-C	· Federal/state govn't have responsibiliy to manage waters in the public trust for max. long-term benefit for current/future generations. This is not being done.	1	General-fails to meet wqs/uses				
			22-D	· TMDLs show that existing programs are not working (high water temps, sediment loads and nutrients).	1	General-water quality;				
			22-E	· Many states have stronger NPS controls for forest practices. OR is frequently judged as the weakest along the west coast. Its time for them to change.	2	Forestry-General	For	1		
	citizen	3/14/14	23-A	· Supports proposed decision (on all counts)---4 forestry concerns, osds and new devel.	2	Decision		1		
			23-B	· Also necessary for state to include ag MM necessary for achieving WQS.	2	Ag-add MMs	For			
	citizen	3/14/14	24-A	· Supports disapproval decision.	1	Decision		1		
			24-B	· Commentor is fisherman that as witnessed OR's inability to protect fish-bearing streams from forestry runoff (logging and rd building).	1	Forestry-general; Forestry-roads				
			24-C	· BOF/ODF have had proposals to improve stream protection come before than but to date, have failed to take action.	1	Forestry-riparian				
			24-D	· DEQ has also failed to take action to respond to forestry issues too.	1	Forestry-General	For			
	citizen	3/14/14	25-A	· Agrees OR has not met conditions and needs to do more to protect coastal wq but imposing penalities on czm and 319 is wrong.	1	Decision; General-fails to meet wqs/uses; Penalities-negative impacts				1
			25-B	· CZM doesn't have authority over remaining conditions yet they stand to loose 1/3 of their federal funding. CZM program does a lot of good to support local communities. Local assist and other important parts of program would be haulted.	1	Penalities-negative impacts				
			25-C	· State legislature is one that needed to take action but has not; rather they have obstructed ODEQ's ability to make the changes the agency wanted to.	1	General-need to improve water quality				
			25-D	· CZM has done excellent work for past 40 yrs and shouldn't be undercut now.	1	Penalities-negative impacts				
			25-E	Encourage NOAA/EPA to continue to work with OR to improve CNP but should not impose penalities.	1	Penalities-negative	For (but no penalities)			
			25-F	Penalties will be counterproductive because it will cripple the work of local governments and the OCMP	1	Penalities-negative				
	citizen	3/14/14	26-A	· Fisherman and no doubt that polluted runoff is an issue.	1	General-need to improve water quality		1		
			26-B	· Supports Tom Davis' opions and supports disapproval decision.	1	Decision	For			
	citizen	3/18/14	27-A	· No one has authority for small lot foresters.	1	Forestry-General				1
			27-B	There is no program that monitors private forestland clear-cuts, or spray and burn operations	1	Forestry-clear cuts; Forestry-pesticides				
			27-C	· Need preventive measures to assure that forestry operations near Clear Lake won't make water undrinkable (get drinking water from lake and has observed small-lot foresters airial and hand spraying pesticides/herbicides near lake.	1	Forestry-pesticides	No opinion			
	citizen	3/18/14	28-A	· Supports disapproval	1	Decision				
			28-B	· Very narrow or non-existent buffers along streams that flow into Siletz. Clear cut to banks and airial spraying over cuts.	1	Forestry-riparian; Forestry-clear cuts; Forestry-pesticides				
			28-C	· Concerned about contamination of drinking water (Newport gets water from Siletz), fish and soil contamination from spraying. Criminal that state does not provide better protections..especially as rate of clear cutting/forestry activities increase due to increase in China exports.	1	Forestry-General; Forestry-clear cuts				
			28-D	· No pesticide mngt measures are in use in ag. lands.	1	Ag-pesticides				
			28-E	· Oregon relies largely on voluntary actions for its CNP and is not using back-up authority.	1	General-voluntary approaches				
			28-F	Even when NOAA/EPA granted OR additional time to address conditions, OR waters are no better than they were before.	1	General-need to improve water quality				
			28-G	· OR hasn't done anything to address polluted runoff in coastal watersheds and shouldn't be given approval until it does.	2	General-need to improve water quality	For	1		
	citizen	3/19/14	29-A	· EPA/NOAA have exceeded the limits defined in the US Constitution. There are too many regulations and restrictions on the states, private property, and individuals. Congress should remove the budgets for EPA/NOAA and have proceeds go back to state of orgin.	1	General	Against	1		
			30-A	· Supports diapproval	1	Decision				

			30-B	· Oregon does not have a program in place to control nonpoint source pollution in our coastal watersheds that carries out CZARA management measures, nor does Oregon have the additional management measures the law requires to achieve and maintain Oregon's water quality standards and measures the law requires to achieve and maintain Oregon's water quality standards and protect Oregon's drinking water.	1	Decision; General-fails to meet wqs/uses		
			30-C	· Disheartened that Oregon has failed to bring logging practices into compliance with federally approved water quality standards...puts contaminants in our drinking water, directly affecting our personal and community health	2	Forestry-General		
			30-D	Agrees with NOAA/EPA that OR need to develop add MM for forestry.	2	Forestry-General		
			30-E	Oregon must increase protection of riparian areas for small and medium fish and non-fish streamsand high-risk landslide areas.	2	Forestry-riparian; Forestry-landslides		
			30-F	OR must address impacts of forest roads better, including specifically so-called "legacy" roads	3	Forestry-roads		
			30-G	OR must increase buffers for the application of pesticides to both fish and non-fish bearing streams and take other actions to prevent pesticides from entering water that affects people, fish, and wildlife.	3	Forestry-pesticides		
			30-H	· DEQ failed to adhere to its commitments that were foundation of 2010 settlement agreement and 16 yrs after conditional approval, has failed to make changes that are required.	3	General		
			30-I	· ODFW and NMFS agree many freshwater environmental impacts on Oregon coast coho are human related, including "rearing and spawning habitat loss. (see: http://www.dfw.state.or.us/fish/species/coho.asp). Even ODF has found its logging practices violate water quality standards (see: http://www.science.oregonstate.edu/~madsenl/files/GroomDentMadsen2011.pdf)	3	Salmon-need more protection; Forestry-General; General-fails to meet wqs/uses		
			30-J	· Watersheds experience landslides from failed logging roads. Sites 4 landslides in Arch Cape (drinking water watershed) in 2013.	3	Forestry-landslides		
			30-K	· 20 ft buffers ODF mandates on drinking water streams are too narrow to w/stand blowdowns and provide much protection from airial spraying.	4	Forestry-riparian		
			30-L	· Complete lack of buffers on non-fish streams make sedimentation a constant impairment/risk.	4	Forestry-riparian		
			30-M	· The drinking water for our communities routinely have high levels of known carcinogens, trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids. These high levels are caused when excess sediment that enters public waters from logging roads and inadequate riparian buffers reacts with disinfectants required to treat the water.	4	Forestry-General; Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads		
			30-N	·To meet federal drinking standards, both Arch Cape Water District and the City of Rockaway Beach had to install extra filter membranes at signficant cost. Now entire community faces higher water bills.	4	Forestry-General		
			30-O	· CZARA requires OR to demonstrate that it has additional MMs to meet water quality standards and protect designated uses (salmon, amphibians, drinking water). Oregon has failed to do this. OR relies heavily on voluntary measures which are worthless since tehy are not being adhered to or enforced.	4	General-fails to meet wqs/uses; General-voluntary approaches		
			30-P	·Does not agree with EPA/NOAA that Oregon "may" have adequate stream buffers for pesticide use on streams with salmon but is encouraged that NOAA/EPA find that the state doesn't have good buffers on non-fish breaing streams. Most drinking water flows through non-fishbearing streams.	4	Forestry-pesticides		
			30-Q	· Oregon's pesticide discharge permit allows spraying forest canopy over water.	4	Forestry-pesticides		
			30-R	· State's failure to monitor water quality after sparying ensures that need for better buffers and laws won't occur. DEQ monitoring in Jetty Creek after spray was positive for glyphosate showing legal buffers aren't working.	4	Forestry-pesticides; Monitoring-improvements needed		
			30-S	· Thinks NOAA/EPA are wrong for lauding Oregon's Pesticide Stewardship Partnership Program even when there are not pilots in coastal area.	4	Forestry-pesticides		
			30-T	· Doesn't see how NOAA/EPA can find that OR provides sufficient protection to fish-bearing streams when EPA has still failed to change pesticide lables as required by NMFS.	5	Forestry-pesticides		
N. Coast Basin Coalition	organization	3/19/14	30-U	States excuse about inadequate studies and need to postpone actiosn to allow for additional research is unacceptable. Research already exists that shows problems. (Cites DEQ 2011 WQ Status and Action Plan for Northcoast Basin)	5	Forestry-General	For	1
			31-A	· Supports disapproval. OR does not have a valid plan to control nonpoint source pollution in its coastal watersheds.	1	Decision		1
			31-B	· State is failing to protect its already imperiled runs of native salmon/steelhead.	1	General-fails to meet wqs/uses; Salmon-need more protection		
			31-C	State hasn't been able to reign in forestry and lags far behind other states.	1	Forestry-General		

(b) (6)	citizen	3/19/2014	31-D	· Timber companies are unaccountable for overuse of pesticides, landslides caused by poorly maintained logging roads, and increased sediment load in our rivers which inhibit salmon spawning ability.	1	Forestry-pesticides; Forestry-landslides; Forestry-roads	For		
	citizen	3/19/14	32-A	· Supports disapproval. Echoes Beyond Toxic's letter: http://www.beyondtoxics.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/CZARA_BeyondToxicsFindings2014March18.pdf	1	Toxics/Pesticides	for		1
Columbia River Estuary	organization	3/19/14	33-A	· Against disapproval. Will negatively impact small communities that rely on NOAA/EPA funding for water quality improvements.	1	Decision	Againts	1	
			33-B	· Receives $ from CZM program to support coastal planner position that is involved in many water quality/habitat restoration efforts at local level and plays key role in implementing czm program at local level.	1	Penalities-negative impacts			
			33-C	· NOAA and EPA need to give state more time to develop CNP--its very challenging process and takes time.	2	General-need more time			
Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition	organization	3/19/14	34-A	· Supports disapproval decision.	1	Decision			1
			34-B	· While forestry is important contributor to NPS, in particular, concerned that OR's programs for new devel and OSDS are not sufficient to meet wqs.	1	Forestry-General; New Devel; OSDS			
			34-C	· Agrees that state needs a commitment to enforce volutnary measrues. NOAA/EPA should require state provide a clear path forward for implementing the new management measures consistent with the 6217(g) guidance, whether by incorporating it into existing the NPDES general permit or crafting a new permit, and require regulatory action if voluntary measures do not result in meaningful and good faith efforts to achieve compliance. Particularly important given the questionable effectiveness of the existing 1200C NPDES general permit for construction activities.	2	New Devel			
			34-D	If the state chooses a TMDL implementation approach to address new deve, we agree that the guidance must require DMAs include control measures applicable to small MS4s under the Phase II program, and that Oregon must adopt a regulatory back-up approach in order to ensure that the guidance is implemented correctly by the DMAs...if not, then state can't say it will be able to meet wqs and protect designated uses.	2	New Devel			
			34-E	· OSDS systems must be sited in locations where they are properly separated from groundwater. Restricting system density lowers the nitrate input to ground water. Proper sizing of the system is important to minimize concentrations of contaminants and prevent hydraulic overloading. Proper maintenance and regular inspection also needed.	3	OSDS			
			34-5	· Supports the state's planned outreach efforts to educate property owners and promote voluntary inspections. Also agrees with NOAA/EPA that a lack of inspection or other enforcement mechanism undermines the effectiveness of Oregon's voluntary management measures.	3	OSDS	For		
			35-A	·Supports disapproval. Local salmon runs have been devestated by forestry/development.	1	Decision; Salmon-need more protection; Forestry-General; New deve	for		1
			35-B	·Recent pollution wiped out all coho eggs in local hatchery and kills frogs/salmon in local stream. Paper said state was not investagating pollution source.	1	General-salmon; General-fails to meet wqs/uses			
			35-C	·Oregon's efforts to address nonpoint pollution of our waters has been monumental failure (Hecta Water Dist. Near Clear Lake)	2	General-need to improve water quality			
			35-D	·Clear Lake is directly threatened by pesticide and herbicide applications inside the watershed, as well as land disturbance on steep slopes near the lake from logging operations.	2	Forestry-pesticides; Forestry-General			
			35-E	·DEQ, Lane County, and the City of Florence all regularly adopt rules and regulations which allow development that will obviously pollute the aquifer - commercial stormwater drainage directly into pipes in the aquifer, residential development on septic systems next to lakes and surface water, logging activities that include application of all manner of chemicals, etc.	2	New Devel; OSDS; Forestry-General; Forestry-pesticides			
			35-F	·Water District tried to prevent the spraying of fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides inside the Clear Lake watershed. The board was informed that there was nothing that could be done until it could be proven that something had actually harmed the water - after the spraying had been allowed.	3	Forestry-pesticides			
			35-G	·The protection zone language for herbicide spraying was purposefully written by Lane County to be completely ineffective as far as application to logging operations inside the watershed, and minimal as to pollution from other human activities.	3	Forestry-pesticides			
			35-H	·Oregon politicians and officials, in my opinion, are unable to stand up to the heavy political and financial influence wielded by the timber and development industries in Oregon - influence which prevents any meaningful regulatory actions regarding nonpoint pollution of our waters.	4	Forestry-general			

(b) (6)	citizen	3/19/14	35-I	·Oregon does not have a workable program that meets the requirements of EPA and NOAA for a coastal nonpoint pollution program. Piecemeal approaches such as promises to increase TMDL's, tighten Department of Forestry riparian rules and decommission legacy roads, are insufficient as basic management measures to grant Oregon approval for a nonpoint program.	4	New devel; Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads; General-water quality			
			35-J	·NOAA/EPA need to require Oregon to provide not only a solid framework of basic management measures, but also a detailed and concrete list of additional management measures to actually protect riparian areas, and provide substantially increased protections for fertilizer, herbicide and pesticide applications near fish-bearing and non-fish bearing streams.	4	Forestry-riparian; Forestry-pesticides			
			35-K	·As long as Oregon governmental agencies continue to receive Federal monies for this program, it will never create an enforceable (much less enforced) and therefore effective, program.	4	Penalities			
Tillamook Estuary Partnership	organization	3/19/14	36-A	· Recognize the need to improve water quality but urges NOAA/EPA to rethink proposed decision due to signifcant impacts penalities would have on state's ability to continue to improve water quality.	1	Penalities-negative impacts; General need to improve water quality	Against	1	
			36-B	· 319 and 306 $ is used to do a lot of good things to improve water quality (OWEB, TMDLs, monitoring, assit to local govn't) that are amoung the most important tools in addressing NPS.	1	Penalities-negative impacts			
			36-C	· Penalities hurt agencies/programs but don't change the rules.	1	Penalities-negative impacts			
			36-7	· Ask that NOAA/EPA continue to work with state to come into compliance but delay/avoid penalities. Reach out to partners like TEP to help address remaining conditions.	3	Penalities			
Lincoln County Board of Commissions	organization	3/19/14	37-A	· Against penalities.	1	Penalities	Against	1	
			37-B	· $27,000/yr dept. receives from OR CZM is important part of budget for implementing czm on ground and controlling growth.	1	Penalities-negative impacts			
			37-C	· Oregon has strong land use planning and watershed mngt programs that benefit from this funding.	1	Penalities-negative impacts			
			37-D	· Taking away significant federal $ will be counterproductive. It will take years to recover from funding loss and will likely not result in the changes NOAA/EPA seek.	1	Penalities-negative impacts			
(b) (6)	citizen	3/19/14	38-A	· Need better mngt of toxics. There is excessive and indiscriminate use of toxic chemical poisons in land management, including agriculture and tree farms.	1	Toxics/Pesticides	For	1	
	citizen	3/19/14	39-A	· Need to consider all the good work cattleman have done to protect water quality. Commentor is cattleman and fisherman that fences his creek and enjoys salmon that run up it.	1	Ag-General; General-made improvements in water quality	Unclear		1
	citizen	3/20/14	40-A	· Supports proposed disapproval. Significant clear cuttings occuring in "protected" (Clear Lake) watershed w/ minimal (10 ft) buffers between waterways (including drinking water source) and homes.	1	Decision; Forestry-clear cutting; Forestry-riparian		1	
			40-B	Spraying and burning also occurs very close to (and over) homes too causing health problems and contaminating drinking water. This should not be allowed.	1	Forestry-pesticides			
			40-C	· Attempting to relocate during spray/burn events causes financial hardship and spray/burn permits can last for months. Owners are given no warning when activities will occur. Property values are lowered and no one would buy home if tried to sell due to publicity of harmful forestry activities in area.	2	Forestry-pesticides			
			40-D	· Shocked that OR allows this to happen to its citizens and hopes laws change soon to protect citizen health and drinking water.	2	Forestry-general	For		
	citizen	3/20/14	41-A	· Supports disapproval and Lisa Arkin's (Beyond Toxics) letter	1	Decision; Toxics/Pesticides		1	
			41-B	· Lives in WA and notes WA aquaculture and USDA spray directly over estuaries--state and local authorities are reluctant to stop them.	1	Toxics/Pesticides			
			41-C	· NOAA/EPA need to look at WA's pesticide practices too. Commentor believes WA pay "lip service" to the 100ft buffer requirements they have for pesticide application but lack of enforcement leads to impaired waters and starfish die-offs.	1	Toxics/Pesticides	For		
			42-A	· Supports diapproval	1	Decision			
			42-B	· Oregon does not have a program in place to control nonpoint source pollution in its coastal watersheds that is sufficient to carry out the CZARA management measures, as well as the additional management measures the law requires to achieve and maintain Oregon's water quality standards, including protecting Oregon's designated uses, including drinking water standards.	1	Decision; General-fails to meet wqs/uses			
			42-C	OR's current WQS and drinking water standards are failing to protect drinking water	1	General-fails to meet wqs/uses			

(b) (6)	citizen	3/20/14	42-D	· Jetty Creek watershed provides drinking water to Rockaway Beach. 80% of watershed has been clearcut over past several years even though DEQ source water assessment noted these are steep slopes with erosive soils.	1	Forestry-clear cutting; Forestry-landslide		
			42-E	· Rockaway Beach drinking water has exceeded the EPA standards for allowable trihalomethane (THM) for the last three years (forms when add Cl to overly turbid waters).	2	Forestry-General		
			42-F	· Because its been clearcut, a lot of spraying has occurred in drinking water watershed. Drinking water had tested positive for glyphosate.	2	Forestry-pesticides		
			42-G	· No coordination between DEQ/ODF to conduct pesticide monitoring in timely manner and community is given no warning of spraying.	2	Forestry-pesticides; Monitoring-improvements needed		
			42-H	· No monitoring of airial drift of pesticide even when OR Health Admin says can drift for 2-4 miles.	2	Forestry-pesticides; Monitoring-improvements needed		
			42-I	After having been in contact with numerous public agencies, we are certain that Oregon does not have sufficient laws and regulations in place to insure safe and clean drinking water, as well as adequate fish and wildlife habit.	2	General-fails to meet wqs/uses	For	1
	citizen	3/20/14	43-A	· Supports disapproval even it if means loss of $4M.	1	Decision; Penalities-benefits		
			43-B	Oregon FPA aren't effective and state has no intentions to improve.	1	Forestry-General		
			43-C	· ODF and Gov's Natural Resource staff say state's land use laws provide protections but if they worked, wouldn't have problems we see today.	1	Forestry-General		
			43-D	· Logging around Quartz Creek denuded the area. Designation of spotted owl sites and high risk areas meant nothing to operator. Hills, road failures, and on-going erosion verify the consequences of ODF's ineffective rules and laws.	1	Forestry-clear cutting; Forestry-General; Forestry-roads		
			43-E	Clear that OR forest practices are far behind CA and WA. There are signifant differences in setbacks, notification or application process and consequences for non-compliance rather than just passing the consequences on to future generations.	2	Forestry-General; Forestry-riparian		
	citizen	3/20/14	43-F	· With 70% of Oregon's streams threatened or endangered because of temperature, sediment and chemicals it is past time to reign in these Oregon logging practices and laws do not begin to protect ecosystems or future generational needs	2	Forestry-General; General-fails to meet wqs/uses	for	1
			44-A	· Support disapproval.	1	Decision		
			44-B	· OR does not have effective programs in place to limit nonpoint source pollution in our coastal watersheds. The plans and rules they do have are not actually working programs sufficient to meet and maintain water quality standards and protect our clean water, fish and other public uses.	1	General-fails to meet wqs/uses; General-need to improve water quality		
			44-C	· State needs to adopt additional, enforceable management measures most importantly in agricultural and forested lands	1	Ag-add MMs		
			44-D	·Areas where program improvement needed that could actually work to control polluted runoff from logging would be protection of riparian areas for small and medium streams (fish and non-fish bearig), including sufficient riparian buffers for application of pesticides along non-fish streams; treating old logging roads often built on fill that are leaching sediment, protection of high-risk landslide areas from cuts	1	Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads; Forestry-landslides		
			44-E	·Concur that OR does not have adequate protections for new devel. Seems to be little ESC used.	1	New devel		
			44-F	·Oregon’s biggest lack in management measures to help us meet water quality standards to protect our Oregon coast coho, amphibians, and drinking water and other uses may be Oregon’s lack of agricultural practices. Legacy areas where there is only a buffer of blackberries along our rivers and streams do not need to be planted, cows trample our stream banks and don’t need to be fenced out are common sights. Animal waste runs off through eroding fields into our streams.	1	Ag-General; Ag-legacy; Ag-buffers		
	citizen	3/20/14	44-G	Concerned that beavers, which could help re-build our downcutting streams channels and make complex floodplains and wetlands, are trapped or hunted out.	1	Beavers	For	1
			45-A	·NPS is biggest threat to OR coastal waters habitats, etc.	1	General-water quality		
	citizen	3/20/14	45-B	Large industry (forestry roads and spraying) is impacting water quality. OR needs laws to protect water quality. Need to use CNP to improve these issues and laws to provide better oversight.	1	Forestry-roads; Forestry-pesticides	For	1
			46-A	·Supports disapproval	1	Decision	For	1
				OR doesn't have programs in place to meet CZARA requirements, including add MMs, and meet wqs and designated uses.	1	General-needs to meet wqs/uses		

(b) (6)	citizen	3/20/14	46-B	·Oregon is failing to protect are native fish; native aquatic and aquatic-dependent wildlife including birds, mammals, and amphibians; public and private drinking water; fishing, including eating fish free from contamination; swimming, wading, and boating; and my ability to enjoy the aesthetic qualities of Oregon's waters and wetlands.	1	General-needs to meet wqs/uses		
			46-C	· State is not doing enough to prevent polluted runoff from forestry--especially related totimber harvesting and riparian protection (fish and nonfish-bearing streams and for pesticide application).	2	Forestry-General; Forestry-riparian; Forestry-pesticides		
			46-D	· Concerned about chemical use and its impacts on neighboring property (sites example of husband experiencing side effects from alledged nearby pesticide use and contamination of domestic water supplies). Need to do more than just adhear to label requirements--that shouldn't be all that is legally required for industry to meet.	5	Forestry-pesticides		
			46-E	Concerned about insufficient or complete lack of warning from ODF when pesticides will be used near property.	5	Forestry-pesticides		
			46-F	ODF's assumptions, policies, laws and practices, pose a huge threat to the quality of life, long term economic viability, and sustainability of our communities.	5	Forestry-General		
			46-G	OR needs to protect surface drinking water in Deer Creek Watershed…critical source of water for residents.	6	Forestry-General; General-needs to meet wqs/uses		
			46-H	Oregon doesn't have programs in place to protect and restore riparian areas needed to maintain cool stream temperatures and habitat, protect and restore channel conditions from modification, protect and restore wetlands, identify where more protection is needed to protect important habitat for species, identify where more pollution control is needed to protect uses, monitor water quality and use water quality data to improve pollution controls, monitor pesticide use and impacts, assess whether pollution controls are reducing pollution and improving water quality, link the enforcement agencies and process with other agencies, or use enforcement when voluntary actions are not adequate to protect water quality.	7	Forestry-riparian; Ag-riparian; Hydromod; Wetlands; Monitoring-improvements needed; Toxics/Pesticides; General-voluntary approaches		
	citizen	3/20/14	47-A	· Support proposed decision and finding doc.	1	Decision	for	1
			47-B	· Important for state to include additional MM for agriculture.	1	Ag-add MMs		
The Freshwater Trust	organization	3/20/14	73-A	Use data to uniformly establish, prioritize, and track programmatic progress towards water quality goals. Need better effectiveness monitoring to be able to make adapative changes as needed to voluntary and other programs. Cites ag, in particular. Need better science to inform implementation targets and determine how well programs are working. (Ex. TFT's recent use of LiDAR to determine ability of buffers to produce adequate shade). Moving forward with new Ag regs without first understanding the gap between the problem and current conditions and without data-based benchmarks for chipping away at the problem will only perpetuate issues moving forward.	1, 2, 3	Monitoring - improvements needed; Ag - General	for	1
			73-B	Focus on outcomes and support the tools that achieve progress on the ground. The loss of approximately $4 million per year in funding for on-the-ground restoration runs wholly counter to what all agree is needed on the ground.	3	Penalties - negative impacts		
			73-C	NWEA's claim that CZARA needs to be achieving WQS now is not correct. CZARA obligations may not currently require controls, but instead contemplate future actions.	4, 5	General		
			73-D	Requests that NOAA/EPA include TFT's 4/22/13 response to NWEA's March 13, 2013 to EPA Regarding Medford Permits to record. TFT's letter corrects factual and legal inaccuracies in NWEA's letter. Also should include TFT's 9/27/13 public comments to Oregon DEQ on Wilsonville's now-withdrawn water quality trading program as section III(C)(4)(d) of the Proposed Finding.	5, 6	General - Public comment		
			48-A	· State has gotten by with an ineffective piecemeal approach, including promises to tighten TMDL's, increase the size of riparian buffers under Department of Forestry rules for logging on private lands, decommission and/or restore so-called legacy roads in forestlands, and craft a voluntary approach to onsite septic leakage. All of these things are necessary, but none are remotely sufficient to solve the problems facing coastal communities.	1	General-need to improve water quality; Forestry-riparian buffers; Forestry-roads; OSDS		1
			48-B	· Supports disapproval. Lack of NOAA/EPA action and penalities has allowed OR to continue limping along with half-measures for seventeen years that are effective while drinking water and other impairments occur.	7	Decision; Penalties		
			48-C	State has refused to create, use, enforce and maintain a nonpoint program that protects the designated uses.	2	General-fails to meet wqs/uses		
			48-D	· There are no 6217 MM to protect drinking water from logging--the central issue for coastal communities.	2	Forestry-General		

			48-E	Agree that state need to adopt add. MM for forestry. Otherwise WQS std/designated uses (drinking water) won't be met.	2	Forestry-General		
			48-F	· Drinking waters are surrounded by private forest land or are below forest operations. 20ft buffers on fish-bearing streams do not protect from sedimentation and pesticide/herbicide use.	2	Forestry-riparian		
			48-G	Concerned about ODF's vague public notification requirements when spraying.	2	Forestry-pesticides		
			48-H	ODF/DEQ don't have regular testing protocols for pesticides after sprays.	2	Forestry-pesticides		
			48-I	Lack of sufficient protection for non-fish bearing streams is significant issue. Agree with NOAA/EPA that add MM for better rip protection of non-fish bearing streams is needed.	3	Forestry-riparian		
			48-J	The 20-foot riparian buffer where required is completely ineffective, and subject to blowdown in even a moderate coastal storm.	3	Forestry-riparian		
Oregon Coast Alliance	organization	3/20/14	48-K	~40% of residents in the coastal region live outside of UGBs which means that the majority of those residents are on septic systems. Minimal enforcement. Sites example of how worked with Dunes Creek to adopt their own OSDS ordiance to require regular inspections since county was not doing enough. Attached several related ODSD docs for Dunes City. Sites other examples where hot spots of failing systems yet nothing has been done.	4	OSDS		
			48-J	Voluntary OSDS proposal will not work (it didn't in Dunes City). No tracking and DEQ lacks resources to do so. Must require OR to require Oregon, to create, maintain and enforce an onsite septic program that requires at least: (a) mandatory inspection every few [three to five] years; (2) mandatory pumping initially and subsequently after inspection whenever needed; (3) a step-by-step program through which Oregon will help homeowners with grants and low cost loans who need help with pumping costs and/or must replace old, failing septic systems; (d) explicit enforcement mechanisms. If counties have the option to manage the program, the same funding and enforcement mechanisms would need to be in place.	5	OSDS	For	
			49-A	Supports disapproval.	1	Decision	for	1
			19-B	OR doesn't have program in place to meet CZARA requirement and WQS and protect designated uses	1	General-fails to meet wqs/uses		
			49-C	Oregon has failed to control run-off pollution from timber harvest and logging roads.	1	Forestry-General; Forestry-roads		
			49-D	State has failed to control polluted runoff from urban development and roads, highways and bridges.	1	New Devel		
			49-E	Insufficient riparian buffers for fish and non-fish bearing streams contributes to polluted runoff and doesn't have programs in place to adequately protect and restore riparian areas needed to maintian cool stream temperatures and habitat.	1	Forestry-riparian		
			49-F	OR has failed to control polluted runoff from eroding streambanks and shorelines and the effects of dams on water and habitat and channel modification and doesn't have programs in place to provide adequate protection	1	Hyrdomod		
			49-G	OR has failed to control polluted runoff from erosion and sedimentation from agricultural lands and livestock destruction of riparian areas.	1	Ag-General; Ag-buffers		
			49-H	OR doesn't have programs in place to protect streams/fish from polluted runoff from pesticide use on forest land and monitor pesticide use and impjacts.	1	Forestry-pesticides		
			49-I	OR doesn't have programs in place to adequately assess whether pollution controls are reducing pollution and improving water quality;	1	Monitoring-improvements needed		
Native Fish Society	organization	3/20/14	49-J	Doesn't believe Oregon has described link between the enforcement agencies and process with other agencies and use enforcement when voluntary actions are not adequate to protect water	1	General-voluntary approaches		
			53-A	Supports disapproval.		Decision		1
			53-B	OR doesn't have programs in place to protect drinking water. Problems with logging, pesticide use, quarries.	1	General-Forestry		
			53-C	Logging rds/overharvesting/landslides cause excess turbidity that reacts with Cl to produce carcinogens.	1	wqs/uses; Forestry-		
			53-D	No monitoring after spraying to understand true impacts/risks. Little warning when spraying occurs.	1	Forestry-pesticides		
			53-E	Need to require turbidity monitoring of streams during and after rainstorms and use enforcement for excess turbidity. Need road surface condition monitoring on a regular basis.	2	Monitoring-improvements needed		
			53-F	Problems with FPA include restrictions on clearcuts to 120 ac by one owner (doesn't account for cumulative impacts of nearby owners)	2	Forestry-clear cutting		
			53-G	Need to ensure quarries operating in drinking water areas are inspected regularly and regulated properly.	2	Monitoring-improvements needed		

Oceanside Cleanwater Subcommittee	organization	3/15/14	53-H	DOH only requires inspection of drinking water for organic toxics every 3 yrs. Needs to be more frequent and relevant to when spraying occurs.	2	Monitoring-improvements needed	for	
(b) (6)	Shellfish Program lead (ODA)	3/6/14	51-A	*Supports disapproval.*	1	Decision		1
			51-B	*OR needs to do more to prevent NPS to bays/estuaries. All but one of the bays in which shellfish are farmed commercially require daily monitoring because of pollution impacts of a non-point source origin. Some of these growing areas may end up being closed for over 100 days each year for pollution reasons*	1	*General- Need to Improve Water Quality*		
			51-C	*A more rigorously regulated and monitored onsite program is needed to prevent toxic bacteria outbreaks like Coos Bay 2013.*	1	*OSDS*		
			51-D	*A closer and more critical look at how effectively pollution from agricultural origin is being controlled is needed*	2	*Ag-General*	*for*	
(b) (6)	rancher/farmer	3/20/14	64, 66, 68-A	Against disapproval. Disapproval punishes the agriculture community and our strong efforts to meet the requirements of the CNPCP and improve water quality conditions	1	Ag - General; Penalties - Negative impacts	Against	3
			64, 66, 68-B	Values the CNPCP program and 319 $ because programs provide funding for stream improvement and restoration projects and monitoring in our areas. Penalities are counterintuitive	3	General; Penalties - Negative impacts		
			64, 66, 68-C	Many ranchers and farmers in my area have worked hard as required by the AWQMP rules to contribute towards the State's efforts to meet or exceed water quality standards. For instance, local farmers and ranchers have invested hundreds of hours in developing, and re-developing Ag Water Quality Management Plans that formulate watershed goals and investment priority areas that will continue to enhance water quality and ensure the State can meet its water quality obligations. To lose funding for these efforts would be discouraging and limit the capacity to achieve future water quality goals. He has planted trees and provides woodland/riparian boards around creeks.	1	Ag - General; Penalties - Negative imacts		
			64, 66, 68-D	Oregon is meeting and in many ways exceeding the federal statutory and regulatory requirements for Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA) grant funding.	1	General		
			64, 66, 68-E	CZARA MMs are required to be economically achievable; see 16 USCS § 1455b(g)(5)	1	Ag - General		
			64, 66, 68-F	ODA identifies agriculture activities that are preventing achievement or maintenance of water quality standards and works with farmers to modify, reduce, or remove them from our operations. ODA works with farmers to address problems voluntarily before going to enforcement.	2	Ag - General; Ag - EP&Ms		
			64, 66, 68-G	Between 1998 and 2012, OWEB contributed nearly $18 million for coastal agricultural water projects and over $5 million was provided in-kind by local SWCDs and landowners. This contributed to the restoration of 956 linear stream miles and 2,759 acres of upland agricultural land treatments. On top of that, land owners have voluntarily enrolled thousands of acres in federal programs that are designed to improve water quality. We have done this with the understanding that the AWQMP and our work would meet federal and state requirements for agriculture.	2	Ag - General; Ag - Buffers		
			64, 66, 68-H	EPA nor NOAA, haven't provided specific data or information to support their claim that NPS problems from ag are widespread.	2	Ag - General		
			64, 66, 68-I	AWQMP requires ODA to implement site-specific and site-appropriate controls. These controls are designed to address actual water quality issues with economically achievable measures. In my area, farmers and ranchers are planting trees along streams, fencing streams with buffered areas, and providing alternative water sources for cattle	3	Ag - General; Ag - Buffers		
Land Watch Lane County	organization	3/20/14	52-A	Supports disapproval.		Decision	For	1
			52-B	FPA is written to protect the timber industry, not the human and wildlife communities it invades, riparian ordinances established to facilitate development and private property "rights" that eschew public responsibility have assured the steady degradation of Oregon's environmental health and	1	General-Forestry		
			54-A	Supports disapproval even though recognizes penalities will hurt programs working to do good.	1	Decision		1
			54-B	OR needs improved pesticides application restrictions and protections for all classes of streams in both forestry and agricultural areas. Additionally, we encourage EPA and NOAA to require even greater pesticide protection standards for all land use areas within the Oregon Coastal Zone to prevent many of the unmonitored dangers that these chemicals pose to humans and aquatic species, like salmon.	1	Forestry-Pesticdes; Agriculture-Pesticides		
			54-C	Supports NOAA/EPA rationales for why OR hasn't meet CZARA requirements, including concerns raised about ag.	3	Decision		
			54-D	Oregon's pesticide laws, forestry management laws, clean water laws, and its implementing regulatory programs fail to adequately protect coastal zone resources and the people living within the coastal zone from the dangers of the increasing use of pesticides across all land uses and activities, but especially in	3	Forestry-Pesticdes; Agriculture-Pesticides		

			54-E	Although NOAA/EPA found Oregon's state-level frameworks and actions to address pesticide water quality controls sufficient and even commendable because of their monitoring mandates and multi-agency management team, none of these pilot monitoring programs are occuring in the coastal zone.	3	Forestry-Pesticdes; Agriculture-Pesticides		
			54-F	EPA and NOAA improperly assume that, should riparian buffer standards for type N streams and monitoring programs within the coastal zone adhere to existing state laws and programs concerning water quality and pesticides, then Oregon's CNPCP would warrant approval. We disagree because existing state and federal laws fail to address large swaths of the pesticide application activities and fail to collect critical pesticide application and risk data.	3	Forestry-Pesticdes; Agriculture-Pesticides		
			54-G	Documented in a recent report, Oregon's Industrial Forests and Herbicide Use: A Case Study of Risk to People, Drinking Water and Salmon, private forestry operations in Oregon operate under antiquated and loose regulations, allowing aerial spraying and unmonitored applications of pesticides as compared to their federal forestry operation and border-state counterparts. Specifically 1)There are known endocrine disrupting chemicals entering our drinking water sources and fish-bearing streams. 2) Oregon does not require a no-spray buffer near homes and schools. 3) Aerial herbicide sprays regularly occur directly over headwaters and tributaries of protected salmon streams. 4) Oregon permits pesticides to be sprayed with only the smallest protective buffer of 60 feet from salmon and steelhead streams—a buffer significantly smaller than other Northwest states with similar forest and river ecosystems. 5) Stricter chemical and pesticide rules apply in neighboring states with heavy forestry industries. 6) Under the current administrative rules, the Oregon Forest Practices Act prohibits researchers, doctors and the public from obtaining accurate information about what types and quantities of herbicides are sprayed	6	Forestry-Pesticdes; Agriculture-Pesticides		
Beyond Pesticides	organization	3/20/14	54-H	Cites environmental and health risks from glyphosate and other pesticides. Also expressed concerns regarding unknown and unmonitored risks of pesticides.	4-5, 7-10	Forestry-Pesticdes; Agriculture-Pesticides	for	
			55-A	Supports disapproval	1			1
			55-B	Notes penalities seem counterintutive to Congress' intent with CZARA to improve coastal wq and does not impact the 2 agencies (ODF/ODA) that can actually do something to address issues. DEQ doesn't have authority to tell ODF/ODA to do something and lacks political will to get it.	2	Penalties		
			55-C	Federal agencies have obligation to step in since state lacks will do anything about issues.	2	General		
			55-D	All concerns sited about ag in decision doc are correct based on commentors experience working in Umqua and Mid-Coast Basins. ODA sees its role as advocate for and protector of the agricultural industry, and devoted very little time, attention or resources to enforcement. Only the largest, most egregious cases have been subject to any enforcement action by ODA.	2	Ag-General		
			55-E	Served as advisory member to the Mid Coast Basin Agricultural Area Advisory Committee in its review of the local area plan beginning in 2009, when specific buffer proposals were presented to the committee. All of the specific proposals for riparian protection were rejected by the committee, despite their knowledge of specific water quality problems in the basin created or exacerbated by inadequate riparian vegetation, including stream temperature problems and bacterial contamination from livestock.	3	Ag-Buffers		
			55-F	ODA's area plans focus on impaired areas rather than also focusing on protection: By refusing to require protective management measures, ODA is allowing polluting practices to occur for many years until degraded water quality conditions are documented and Total Maximum Daily Loads developed, self-implementing or otherwise.	3	Ag-General		
			55-G	ODA does not track implementation and effectiveness of ODA area plans: Ag. Monitoring is not sufficient. A monitoring plan developed by ODA was submitted to the State's Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team (part of the state's salmon recovery effort), which found the plan to be lacking in detail and focus, and offered extensive advice to ODA about the basics of monitoring. http://www.fsl.orst.edu/imst/reports/ODA_06-27-06.pdf	3	Ag-General; Monitoring-Improvements Needed		
			55-H	ODA's remoting sensing monitoring of riparian areas showed very little (if any) improvements in buffers. Now ODA may be scrapping remote sensing monitoring program for something else (see link in letter).	3	Ag-General		
			55-I	ODA has authority to take action against legacy issues but lacks political will.	4	Ag-General		
			55-J	Protection of riparian areas: ODF's own study, Ripstream, documents that harvesting on private forest land carries a significant risk (estimated at 40%) that harvesting will result in violations of Oregon's water quality standard for protecting cold water.	4	Forestry-riparian		

(b) (6)	citizen	3/20/14	55-K	In theroy, EQC has legal authority to require changes that will provide protection to streams, the practical reality is that there is no certainty whatsoever that there will be any additional riparian protection provided. EQC/DEQ can petition BOF but they can take 2 yrs to act and even then, could decide no to do anything.	4	Forestry-riparian	for	
			55-L	Significant stream turbidity issues in Suislaw due to forest activities/rds.	5	Forestry-roads		
			55-M	Analysis of pesticide application records in the Triangle Lake area west of Eugene shows that in the study area, more than 20 tons of pesticide products were applied in just a three-year period.	5	Forestry-pesticides		
			55-N	Supports Beyond Toxics Comments. Need mandatory spray buffers and vegetated riparian zone. Buffers around streams.	6	Forestry-pesticides; Forestry-riparian		
			56-A	Support disapproval.	8	Decision		1
			56-B	Concerned about the impacts of polluted runoff from currently defined NPSs that are a product of timber harvest, agriculture and urban development. Specifically how those sources currently raise stream temperatures, and pollute our waterways with bacteria, turbidity and sediment and the ways these types of activities impact stream banks stability, and unnaturally increase the speed of runoff and stream flow following precipitation events, altering the natural hydrograph and changing erosion patterns. These types of pollution and other alterations effect threatened species such as Southern Oregon Northern California Coast (SONCC) coho salmon, other aquatic life and the public's ability to safely recreate and obtain clean drinking water.	1 to 2	General- water quality; general-salmon		
			56-C	OR needs additional MM for forestry. State's claim that land use laws and voluntary FPA are sufficient is false. Much more is needed.	2	Forestry-general		
			56-D	State has had over 16 yrs of notice backed by numerous studies/reports (1998 conditional approval, IMST, Ripstream, NMFS SONCC, Statewide Eval of FPA Effectiveness) that needs to do more with forestry yet they still claim voluntary is way to go.	2 to 3	Forestry-general		
			56-E	NMFS recommeded buffers range from 150-300ft far above 20ft that OR has (only for fish-bearing).	3	Forestry-riparian		
			56-F	Need larger spray buffers (may be better tha mulit-agency approach that attempts to monitor pesticide impacts).	3	Forestry-pesticides		
			56-G	State's July 1, 2013 submission lacks any description or details about what methods the state uses in evaluating effectiveness of BMPs, nor a process for evaluating when additional BMPs may be required to protect beneficial uses, nor any criteria for enforcement if the use (or not) of those BMPs results in detrimental impacts to beneficial uses. The State goes on to claim that "Voluntary reporting of voluntary measures has diminished in past years, however it is reasonable to assume that voluntary measure implementation has not." If reporting has dropped, it does not seem reasonable to assume that implementation continues, considering the voluntary nature.	3	Forestry-roads		
			56-H	States voluntary approach to address new devel isn't sufficient. TMDLs for a number of parameters certainly cover the bulk of the area in question, but may not cover the whole CZARA area, nor would they be for all the parameters that may be at issue in those areas. Needs to be very clear what authority they will use, show development of an implementation structure, a commitment of resources to that structure, a track record of use of backup authority when criteria require it, and a clearly articulated method to evaluate progress. In the interim while those are being developed, the State needs to be clear on what type of outreach and training will be done as part of the voluntary measures that are being proposed.	4	New Development		
			56-I	State needs direct rule for new devel.	4	New Development		
			56-J	OR doesn't have sufficient ag programs to meet CZARA requirements. Inland Rogue Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan (IRAWQMAP) management plans lacks specific thresholds for unacceptable activity, and thus are based on the subjective Rogue Riverkeeer comments RE: NOAA, EPA seek public comment on proposal to disapprove Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Program opinion of ODA staff. ODA does not appear to take water quality issues seriously as enforcement is strictly complaint driven, and enforcement is limited and incredibly slow when it does occur.	5 to 8	Ag-General		
			56-K	ODA staff has informed our staff that enforcement is complaint driven. Enforcement must be more proactive.	6, 8	Ag-General		

Rogue River Keeper	organization	3/20/14	56-L 56-M	When there is enforcement, it is incredibly slow and ineffective. In 2011 Rogue Riverkeeper requested all complaints from since the IRAWQMAP was put in place for the Inland Rogue. Only 20 complaints for both the Inland Rogue and Bear Creek areas were filed, and most of them had limited follow up. In one instance on Antelope Creek first reported in early 2008, it took 1.5 years from the initial complaint of significant bacteria pollution from horses and cows to a letter of non-compliance (report tracking number 08-16). We ask that EPA/NOAA require Oregon to implement additional management measures, in particular for agriculture, forestry and urban development, to meet water quality standards and protect designated uses.	8 8,9	Ag-General Ag-add MMs; Forestry-general, New Development	for	
Oregon Wild	organization	3/20/14	58-A 58-B 58-C 58-D 58-E 58-F 58-G 58-H	Support disapproval. Climate Change Preparation/Mitigation, and Ocean Acidification: Need to prepare for climate change by putting programs in place to prevent harm to water quality and make watersheds more resilient to large storms, by requiring wider stream buffers for forestry and agriculture operations, larger fish-friendly culverts that pass more water from larger storms, improved road drainage, road drainage disconnected from streams, removal of valley bottom and mid-slope roads that intercept the downslope movement of beneficial wood and sediment, reduced road density especially in steep terrain, and better protection for unstable slopes. Oregon's programs for protection of water quality could be improved by fully implementing its statewide land use goals which incorporate concepts of "carrying capacity." Oregon has approved several TMDLs in the Coast Range but the assumptions underlying those TMDLs are about to be undermined by efforts to reduce stream protection on federal forest lands. All of the alternatives proposed by BLM for the revision of its Resource Management Plans in western Oregon call for significant narrowing of stream buffers, and none of the action alternatives maintain the current buffers. http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/alternfaq.pdf The TMDLs approved by the state allow more logging on non-federal lands, under the assumption that there logging near streams on federal lands would be strictly limited. Now it turns out that there will likely be more logging near streams on federal lands, so there needs to be a corresponding decrease in logging near streams on non-federal lands in order to avoid exceeding the watershed scale waste load identified in the TMDLs. Focus on forest issues have been on shade/sediment. Also need large woody debris. Oregon needs greater controls on spraying chemicals such as pesticides and herbicides in coastal watersheds, especially near streams. Cites issues w/ existing OR struture for regulating wq. DEQ delegated authority to ODF/ODA (controlled by industry), lack of public participation, BOF stacked by pro-industry, etc. Cites numerous studies about inadequacy of OFPA and how its worse than federal and neighboring states.	1 3 4 4,5,6 6 6,7 7 to 11	Decision General-need to include other issues; Forestry-general General-need to include other issues Forestry-General Forestry-logging Forestry-General Forestry-pesticides; Agriculture-pesticides Forestry-General; Ag-General; Other Forestry-clear cut; Forestry-landslides, Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads	for	1
(b) (6)	citizen	3/20/14	59-A	Concerned about pesticide spraying. Secondhand account of citizens in western Lane County that had insecticide show up in blood tests and became ill after pesticide spraying. More needs to be done to protect human health from pesticide exposure.	1	Forestry-Pesticides; Ag-Pesticides	unclear	1
			60-A	Supports disapproval. Because 1) basic agricultural management measures are not in place and 2) current agricultural nonpoint source controls are insufficient to protect water quality and designated uses	1	Ag-General		1
			60-B	OR fails to adequately regulate CAFOs. Study by Lewis and Clark Law School's Animal Law Clinic found that ODA lacks federal authorization to manage NPDES programs.	2	[Note: "Ag-CAFOs" category is outside of CZARA's scope]		
			60-C	Oregon does not have basic management measures for agriculture in place because the State fails to adequately regulate CAFOs. Enforcement of agricultural water quality in Oregon is limited and largely complaint-driven. In addition to numerous documented examples of actual pollution, complaints against certain CAFOs are repeatedly submitted with no follow-up done or recorded. Many complainants report that ODA is unresponsive and dismissive of their concerns.	2	Ag-General		

Socially Responsible Agriculture Program	organization	3/20/14	60-D	Agricultural Water Quality Management Area ("AWQMA") plan is entirely voluntary. "The rules adopted under this subsection shall constitute the only enforceable aspects of a water quality management plan." O.R.S. § 568.912(1). "Area rules are the only enforceable aspect of an AWQMA plan." O.A.R. 603-090-0000 (4). And this voluntary program is not backed up by any legal enforcement authority to regulate nonpoint sources as EPA/NOAA requires.	3	Ag-EP&Ms	for	
			60-E	Oregon's CNPCP contains insufficient measures to achieve and maintain water quality standards and protect designated uses. Additional management are needed.	3	Ag-Add MMs		
(b) (6)	citizen	3/20/14	61-A	Supports disapproval	1	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Landslides	for	1
			61-B	Oregon has failed to control NPS from timber harvest and the construction and maintenance of logging roads. Last year I participated in steelhead spawning surveys on the Salmonberry River in Oregon's coast range. I saw the results of poorly planned logging roads on steep slopes where whole hillsides had slid down into the creek below after heavy winter rains. I do not believe that Oregon's Forest Practices Act is adequately protecting the riparian areas which results in degraded water quality for fish/wildlfe and drinking water.	1			
	citizen	3/20/14	62-A	Supports disapproval	1		for	1
			62-B	Concerned with logging impacts from pesticide/herbicide use and habitat "mistreatment". There should be no aerial spraying close to known drinking water sources.	1	Forestry - Pesticides		
			62-C	Need more regular monitoring of drinking water for pesticides/herbicides; designated uses and water quality standards in coastal watersheds are not protected.	1	Monitoring - Improvements needed; Forestry - Pesticides		
			62-D	There should be larger buffers to protect from temperature impacts, particularly in the Siletz River watershed.	2	Forestry - Riparian		
	citizen	2/26/14	63-A	Supports disapproval	1		for	1
			63-B	Concerned with logging impacts, particularly from clearcutting and resultant hillside erosion, which may pollute our drinking water spring. We had severe clearcutting around our private forest and this caused substantial loss of river quality.	1	Forestry - General; Forestry - landslides		
			63-C	Inadequate WQ monitoring of logging impacts	1	Monitoring - Improvements needed		
			63-D	Inadequate protection and restoration of riparian areas	1	Forestry-riparian		
			63-E	Disruption from tree harvests and road construction	1	Forestry-roads; clear cut		
	citizen	3/20/14	76-A	Concerned about pesticide spraying. They have tested posititive for pesticide/herbicides even though they run an organic farm.	1	Forestry - Pesticides	unclear	1
			76-B	Would like to incorporate many other studies/reports by reference (included links in letter)	1	Forestry - Pesticides		
			76-C	Supports pesticide-free buffers around schools, such as near Triangle Lake.	2	Forestry - Pesticides		
Water Watch of Oregon	organization	3/20/14	65-A	Supports disapproval			for	1
			65-B	Comments are limited to highlighting the inadequacy of OWRD's Water Use Basin Program as support for meeting the 6217(g) agricultural management measures and conditions placed on Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program	1	Ag - General		
			65-C	NOAA/EPA findings incorrectly state that OWRD's "Water Use Basin Program . . . supports the irrigation measure by establishing sub-basin classifications and limits on water use to ensure water quality and habitat for sensitive and endangered species is not impaired." This statement is not supported by the contents of any of the coastal Basin Programs. (Attached for reference). To the contrary, Oregon's Basin Programs do not ensure, either legally or practically, that water quality and habitat for sensitive and endangered species will not be impaired. We urge EPA/NOAA to take a close look at the deficiencies of the Basin Programs before attributing any water quality or fish habitat protection value to them as a measure in support of Oregon's agricultural conditions.	1	Ag - General		
			65-D	Oregon's rules provide no assurance that water use will be adequately limited to maintain those minimum flows	2	Ag - General		
			65-E	Basin Programs also fail in practice to protect minimum perennial streamflows and instream rights held by OWRD for the protection of aquatic wildlife and water quality.	2	Ag - General		
			65-F	EPA should disapprove Oregon's agricultural measures... The lack of protection offered by Oregon's Water Use Basin Programs for preservation of aquatic life and designated uses should be acknowledged in the agencies' final determination	2,3	Ag - General		

(b) (6)	Wild Salmon Center, Northwest Guides and Anglers Association, Oregon Chapter of the Sierra Club, Pacific Rivers Council, private citizen	3/20/14	67-A	Supports disapproval although regrets loss of funding.	1	Forestry - General	for	1
			67-B	Oregon does not have a program in place to control nonpoint pollution sufficiently to meet the additional CZARA MM needed to attain/maintain wqs and protect designated uses, particularly due to logging on private lands.	1	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Landslides		
			67-D	Observed sediment loads from forest roads and landslides	1			
			67-D	State's own Ripstream study note inadequacy of buffers to control temperature and other WQ impacts	1	Forestry - Riparian		
			67-E	Additional MMs needed for foresty such as what is described on pg. 7-12 of proposed findings.	1	Forestry - General		
			67-F	Used Salmonberry River in north Coast range as prime example of impacts.	2	Forestry - General		
			67-G	Refutes OR's claims the land use laws provide sufficient protection… even if they've helped prevent sprawl, still need to control forest industry that is damaging remote watersheds	11	Forestry - General		
Lane County Audobon Society of Oregon	organization	3/20/14	69-A	Supports disapproval	1		for	1
			69-B	Waters are at risk from pesticides and other toxic chemicals, oil and grease, sediment, salts, excess bacteria and nutrients released from agricultural and timber lands, from roads and urban areas, from construction and mining areas, from eroding stream banks, livestock, and faulty septic systems.	1	General - Habitat protection		
			69-C	Especially concerned about inadequate buffer for aerial spray pesticide application. Oregon has an inadequately small no-spray buffer zone around fish-bearing streams and no effective program to protect non-fish bearing streams.	2	Forestry - Pesticides; Forestry - Riparian		
Beyond Toxics	organization	3/18/14	70-A	Supports disapproval	1		for	1
			70-B	Our comments address the inadequacies of Oregon's existing program to implement the required CZARA management measures, its inability and disinterest in evaluating the sufficiency of those management measures to ensure pesticides do not violate Oregon's water quality standards and impair its designated uses, its lack of a monitoring program to support such an evaluation, and its lack of practices that protect those designated uses.	1	General - Pesticides; General - Monitoring improvements needed		
			70-C	Beyond Toxics report on pesticide/herbicide use in forestry shows that FPA lacks any program to protect Oregon streams and their beneficial uses (see report attached). Requires no pesticide buffer on non-fish streams even though neighboring states (WA, ID) require 25ft buffers. In non-fish bearing streams, amphibians and crawfish are affected by pesticide application	2	Forestry - General; Forestry - Pesticides; Forestry - Riparian		
			70-D	Unknown risks from synergistic interactions of chemicals mixed together.	2,3	Forestry - Pesticides		
			70-E	Oregon has inadequate protection of fish-bearing streams and drinking water compared to neighboring states.	3	Forestry - Pesticides; Forestry - Riparian		
			70-F	Oregon has no program to determine the presence of forestry pesticides in the air and resulting in drift and deposition onto surface waters and soils.	3,4	Pesticides - Monitoring		
			70-G	Herbicides (e.g., Atrazine) can persist in water and can bind with soil particles, so under OR's FPA, pesticides such as atrazine are sprayed into dry channels that become active in wetter months, carrying herbicides downstream to fish.	4	Forestry - Pesticides		
			70-H	State doesn't have a program to protect groundwater/drinking water.	4	Pesticides - Monitoring		
			70-I	The EPA should require ODF, in consultation with DEQ, to exercise their authority to review, comment, and require modifications of forest vegetation management written plans based on an environmental and water quality risk assessment and proof of compliance with state and federal laws.	4,5	General - Pesticides		
			70-J	Oregon must develop a research program to determine if aerial application of herbicides is necessary for timber production. Oregon needs additional management measures to protect uses and water quality from pesticide drift.	5	Monitoring - Improvement needed; Forestry - Pesticides		
			70-K	Oregon has no program to determine if federal label laws are being complied with.	5	Pesticides - Monitoring		
			70-L	Evidence suggests that federal label restrictions for Atrazine, an Oregon-regulated herbicide, are not being followed. Also, poor record-keeping on pesticide applications	6	Pesticides - Monitoring/ Enforcement		
			77-A	Against disapproval. Believe Oregon's Forest Practices Act, and its implementing regulations, comply with CZARA requirements.	1	General		1

77-B	NOAA/EPA 1998 conditional approval findings and 2013 proposed finding that asserts Oregons needs additional MMs for forestry failed to reference any WQS and included very sparse analysis as to why these MM were needed.	1, 2	General
77-C	Original Findings and the Proposed Findings are both legally and scientifically deficient	2	General
77-D	CZARA statute requires a 3-step analysis for the states to take before additional MMs can be imposed, including: 1) identify land uses which may cause or contribute significantly to a degradation of: (A) those coastal waters where there is a failure to attain or maintain applicable water quality standards or protect designated uses, as determined by the State pursuant to its water quality planning processes; or (B) those coastal waters that are threatened by reasonably foreseeable increases in pollution loadings from new or expanding sources. 2) identify Critical Coastal Areas (CCAs); 3) identify additional MMs within CCAs to address impairments and are necessary to attain WQS. This authority to determine additional MMs is reserved exclusively for the state, not the federal agencies. Further, CZARA doesn't require states to adopt additional MMs that "may be necessary" or are "arguably necessary" to meet WQS, only ones that actually "ARE necessary." NOAA/EPA have provided no indication that their self-selected additional MMs will enable the state to meet WQS.	3, 4	General - Legal; General - Problems with CZARA
77-E	To overcome Oregon's determination that a particular land use does not contribute significantly to a degradation of water quality standards, the Agencies would need to produce evidence to the contrary. Likewise, to overcome Oregon's determination that additional management measures are not "necessary to achieve and maintain water quality standards," the burden would again be on the Agencies to produce evidence to the contrary.	4	General - Legal; General - Problems with CZARA
77-F	Oregon's Forest Practices Act establishes a dynamic program that responds promptly and deliberately to environmental issues as they arise. … With respect to water quality, the Oregon Forest Practices Act (the "OFPA") mandates that the Board of Forestry adopt standards for forest practices that "provide for the overall maintenance" of "water resources, including but not limited to sources of domestic drinking water." ORS 527.710(2)(b). The OFPA also charges the Board of Forestry with establishing "best management practices and other rules applying to forest practices as necessary to insure that to the maximum extent practicable nonpoint source discharges of pollutants resulting from forest operations on forestlands do not impair the achievement and maintenance of water quality standards established by the Environmental Quality Commission." ORS 527.765(1). Note that this language hews closely to the CZARA requirement that the CNPCP include additional management measures necessary to "attain or maintain applicable water quality standards." ... Forest Practice Rules are fully enforceable.	4, 5, 6	Forestry - General; Forestry - Legal
77-G	FPA requires BMP monitoring with adaptive feedback. Board has charged ODF with pesticide use monitoring, OAR 629-620-0700(1), and landslides and public safety monitoring. OAR 629-623-0000(4). In each circumstance, the Board will consider the monitoring results and take appropriate action, including when necessary, development of new forest practice rules. Cites example of 2002 road runoff drainage study that led to improved rules. FP Rules have evolved over time.	5, 6	Forestry - General; Forestry - Legal
77-H	NOAA/EPA findings that that Oregon's existing measures for protection of medium and small fish bearing streams (type-F) and non-fish bearing streams (type-N) are not adequate to protect water quality and designated uses relies on an uncritical view of the 15-year-old Ripstream IMST, and 12 year-old Sufficiency Analysis, and fails to consider the most current and relevant research. At best, it is an incomplete and inaccurate assessment of the most recent science findings. At worst, it represents a fundamental misunderstanding of the science.	7	Forestry - Riparian
77-I	NOAA/EPA misinerpreted the RipStream Study findings. See different RipStream conclusions on p. 8.	8	Forestry - Riparian
77-I	The lack of any discussion about findings from the Watersheds Research Cooperative (the "WRC") represents a huge omission in the Agencies' analysis of the Oregon CNPCP. In the Sufficiency Analysis (ODF and ODEQ 2002) there is a discussion about the adequacy of riparian buffers along small type-N and small and medium type-F streams.	8, 9	Forestry - Riparian

77-J	We disagree that the FPA is not protective of high-risk landslide prone areas. in evaluating the results from Turner et. al. (2010), it is misleading to focus only on landslide density relationships. Rather, it is important to also consider the total number of landslides triggered during major storms. While landslide densities have been shown to be higher in steep terrain with young forest stands, the proportion of this area across mountainous terrain is potentially very low, so that potential increases in sediment delivery to public resources from landslides triggered in these areas is also proportionately small. ... Channel alterations from debris flows are a naturalhabitat-forming process and not necessarily negative.	14, 15, 16	Forestry - Landslides
77-K	EPA argues that Oregon must have additional management measures for forestry to protect HLHLs, to maintain good water quality, and to ensure that designated uses are protected. However, EPA does not offer any objective evidence that these additional measures are necessary. We respectfully suggest that EPA consider a landscape-scale view over long timeframes as the proper context for evaluating whether water quality standards and designated uses are impaired or attained. Disturbance and recovery processes are an essential part of these landscape-driven forest ecosystems.	16, 17	Forestry - Landslides
77-L	From a strictly legal perspective, the Agencies have produced no evidence (much less, substantial evidence), that landslides resulting from forest management activities are causing water quality standard exceedances, or negatively impacting aquatic life more than landslides do under background conditions. Without more, a decision to disapprove Oregon's CNPCP would not withstand judicial review.	17	Forestry - Landslides
77-M	Roads: The Agencies "remain concerned" (about forest roads delivering sediment into streams) without citing a single source indicating a problem exists, without citing any water quality standard or beneficial use the rules fail to protect, indeed without citing a single reason for concern.	17	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Legal
77-N	Roads: There have been significant new rule revisions in 2002 and 2003, and broad success under the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, all detailed thoroughly in the State's July submission to the Agencies.	17	Forestry - Roads
77-O	The agencies allege that the state has not provided "a commitment to exercise its back-up authority to require implementation of additional management measures for forestry roads, as needed." This is ludicrous. The rule revisions in 2002 and 2003 indicate that the OFPA is working precisely as it should, and evidence a continuing commitment by the Board of Forestry to implement additional management measures as needed. One would be hard-pressed to imagine better evidence of the Board's commitment. If there were additional data indicating that forest roads continue to "cause or contribute significantly to a degradation of coastal waters"—an issue ODF is actively monitoring under OAR 629-635-0110—then the Board would initiate a new rulemaking, as it has done repeatedly in the past.	17	Forestry - Roads
77-P	The Agencies also assert that the State has not provided sufficient data to the Agencies to document effectiveness of voluntary efforts under the Oregon Plan. The Agencies suggest that an extensive (and expensive) inventory and reporting program for forest roads is necessary "to determine the extent of forestry road miles not meeting current road standards within the nonpoint management area." Here, the Agencies presume a problem exists (again, without citation to a single source) until the State can prove otherwise. However, nothing in CZARA requires that a state prove a negative. Additionally, data shows that salmon stocks are recovering since the 1990s. Finally, we are not aware of any scientific evidence indicating that habitat and water quality conditions have materially improved in Washington State due to implementation of their road maintenance and abandonment program	18	Forestry - Roads
77-Q	Alleging that Oregon's rules are insufficient without reason, and without any support, is the definition of arbitrary, and a disapproval action on this basis would not survive even cursory judicial scrutiny.	19	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Legal
77-R	Water quality monitoring of a type-N (non-fish bearing) forest stream during and after herbicide spray operations (applied under OFPA rules and guidelines and FIFRA/labeling regulations) shows no evidence of detrimental impacts. Nevertheless, Oregon continues to support monitoring that would identify potential problems should they arise. ... Recent monitoring has not found a problem with contemporary forest aerial herbicide spray operations; in fact just the opposite. Oregon is currently monitoring for over 100 pesticides, which will aloow the state to respond should herbicides be identified at unacceptable levels.	19, 21	Forestry - Pesticides

			77-S	Since 1998 there have been significant changes in how chemicals are applied to forests under FIFRA. Findings from the Spray Drift Task Force and other research led to revisions in chemical labeling. Pesticide applicators are licensed under FIFRA and recent court rulings have further increased regulation of applicators and land owners. Oregon's Forest Practices Act rule guidelines state that applications must comply with the most stringent of requirements of either the label, or forest practice rules and guidelines.	19	Forestry - Pesticides		
Oregon Forest Industries and Oregon Small Woodlands Association	organization	3/20/14	77-T	ODF has developed extensive guidelines for implementing the Oregon Forest Practices Act rules for herbicide applications to forest lands. See Oregon Department of Forestry, Forest Practice Rule Guidance: Chemicals and Other Petroleum Products (2009), available at http://goo.gl/uv8oIH. Also cite pesticide monitoring studies that show no significant impact.	19	Forestry - Pesticides	Against	
			78-A	Agree with NOAA/EPA that state needs to do more to address osds, new devel, and ag but does not support penalities because they will impact important pro-environment programs. Rather hopes state will make improvements to programs to avoid disapproval.	1	Decision	Unclear (against penalities)	1
			78-B	Saw a draft of guidance to urban DMAs regarding post-construction stormwater management, and we believe it will be a helpful document. However, DEQ has not demonstrated that it has the ability to educate DMAs or ensure that the guidance is implemented. DEQ's basin coordinators are spread too thin and the agency lacks the capacity and perhaps the expertise to provide technical assistance to urban DMAs to ensure that TMDLs are implemented.	1	New Development		
			78-C	We believe Oregon should require urban DMAs to adopt specific post-construction stormwater management strategies similar to those required in Phase II MS4 permits, rather than only recommending that they do	2	New Development		
			78-D	DEQ has no way of measuring whether the voluntary OSDS program results in an increase in onsite system inspections. We still think there is a need for regular inspections of existing septic systems, whether it takes place at the time of property transfer or at a different time.	2	OSDS		
			78-E	We would like to see Oregon DEQ take a more proactive role in establishing similar programs in areas where septic systems are impacting water quality – increasing onsite system inspections as well as financing repairs, and measuring the program's effectiveness	2	OSDS		
			78-F	Oregon is currently failing to protect water quality standards and beneficial uses in agricultural areas in our coastal watersheds, including habitat necessary to the survival of native fish and to support both recreational and commercial fisheries. This is due to the failure of the state's agricultural water quality program to control run-off pollution from riparian areas and to control erosion and sediment from agricultural lands on fish bearing streams.	3	Ag -- general; Ag- buffers		
			78-G	It is publicly acknowledged by Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) staff that 100% landowner compliance with current agricultural water quality management area rules alone is not sufficient to meet Water Quality Standards, including TMDL Load Allocations. No restoration of rip. vegetation is required by AWQA rules.	3	Ag -- general; Ag- buffers		
			78-H	ODA has recently developed a new strategy for its water quality program to determine compliance with the rules. This is an important step forward. However, there is still a serious scale problem with the program's ability to ensure compliance with the rules. Under ODA's current plan to assess agricultural landowner compliance with the area rules by 6th field HUC watershed, it can assess compliance in 6-12 6th field HUCs/biennium. At this rate, ODA will be able to assess compliance with its (insufficient) rules in approximately 1500 6th field HUC watersheds containing agricultural land uses statewide in 250 years. This is not a reasonable timeframe to ensure compliance with the rules.	3	Ag - general		
Oregon Environmental Council	organization	3/20/14	78-I	ODA plans to rely on voluntary actions by landowners described in its unenforceable Area Plans to bridge this performance gap between the rules and meeting water quality standards. However, ODA does not have an implementation plan to ensure these voluntary actions occur. Oregon has not quantified the level of additional landowner actions, or their nature, necessary to bridge this gap between compliance with the rules and achieving TMDL Load Allocations.	4	Ag - general		
			71-A	The AWQMP (and AWQMA Rules) meets and exceeds the federal statutory and regulatory requirements of CZARA	2, 11, 12, 13, 14	Ag - General; Ag MMs (pp. 11-14); Ag - Pesticides (p.13)		1

71-B	Agriculture land use represents approximately 5% of the land uses within the coastal zone. The primary agricultural land use within the coastal zone is pasture/hay agriculture, not crop land, which minimizes WQ impacts.	2	Ag - General
71-C	Most, if not all, agriculture landowners are in compliance with the AWQMP rules and, by complying with these rules, meet or exceed CZARA requirements applicable to agriculture. And, as explained below, for any agriculture landowners that are not in compliance with the AWQMP, the State has a process in place to achieve compliance with voluntary and regulatory programs.	2	Ag - General
71-D	CZARA only requires implementation of economically achievable MMs ("economically achievable measures for the control of the addition of pollutants from existing and new categories and classes of nonpoint sources of pollution, which reflect the greatest degree of pollutant reduction achievable through the application of the best available nonpoint pollution control practices, technologies, processes, siting criteria, operating methods, or other alternatives.")	3	General
71-E	Notes the same arguments as OFIC RE: CCAs/add MM are developed by specific state-driven process. OR has not designated critical coastal areas or identified new agriculture land uses or a substantial expansion of existing agriculture land uses that require additional management measures. Therefore, additional management measures for agriculture are unnecessary for CNPCP approval.	3,4	Add'l MMs not needed
71-F	NOAA/EPA don't provide scientific data or substantial evidence that identifies agriculture land uses as a cause or significant contributor to water quality impairment in Oregon's coastal streams. There is no sound scientific evidence to demonstrate that agriculture lands within the coastal zone in fact cause or significantly contributing to water quality degradation. ODA is required to regulate, based on science, those agriculture activities that are causing the type of water pollution that prohibits the State from achieving and maintaining water quality standards.	4	
71-G	As explained in Section III, ODA has the enforcement authority necessary to ensure compliance with watershed basin rules on the coast and throughout the State of Oregon. While opponents of the AWQMP highlight the fact that ODA has only taken a few enforcement actions, implying that ODA is not requiring compliance, nothing could be farther from the truth. The truth is that ODA works directly with land owners in noncompliance to make certain land use changes before enforcement is necessary.	5	Ag - EP&Ms
71-H	Nowhere does CZARA or Section 6217(g) unconditionally require: (1) riparian buffers on agriculture land, (2) that landowners undertake efforts to restore lands to pre -agricultural uses and methods (removing agriculture from the land), (3) management measures that will not result in a reduction of nonpoint source pollution, (4) new or ad hoc water quality standards for pesticides, sediment, or any other listed pollutants, or (5) landowners to change land uses, implement management measures, or	6	Ag - General; Ag - buffers; Ag - Pesticides; Ag - Add'l MMs
71-I	Only after the State identifies land uses that cause or significantly contribute to water quality impairments, the state must then implement additional management measures if necessary to achieve and maintain applicable water quality standards. For the reasons explained below, Oregon's AWQMP meets and implements the 6217(g) requirements and has a process in place to implement additional management measures if necessary.	7	Ag - Add'l MMs (not needed)
71-J	6217(g) "offer[s] State officials a number of options and permit them considerable flexibility in selecting management measures that are appropriate for their State…."20 Further, the 6217(g) guidance suggests management measures but these are written to allow flexibility in implementation. 21 Contrary to claims by critics of the Oregon AWQMP, this means that EPA and NOAA can and must approve state programs that address water quality impairments from certain land uses even where they do not employ the precise management measures outlined in the 6217(g) guidance.	7	General - Holding to higher standard; General - Problems with CZARA
71-K	In areas where an area plan and rules are required, ODA may compel a landowner "to perform those actions on the landowner's land necessary to prevent and control water pollution from agriculture activities" so long as the practice is a factor in causing water quality standards to be exceeded." This provides ODA the authority to require management measures that meet the requirements of 6217(g) or impose additional management measures if necessary.	8	Ag - EP&Ms

			71-L	Using the process of identifying agriculture practices that do in fact contribute to water quality problems and investing in management measures proven to reduce or mitigate pollutant loadings, as well as measures that are achievable because of cost and technology, the State can more efficiently allocate resources for the betterment of coastal waterways. This is precisely the outcome envisioned by the sponsors of the CZARA and is consistent with the statutory language.	8	Ag - General	
			71-M	The proposed agencies' finding references the coho salmon listings and draft recovery plan findings. These documents' references to agriculture impacts to water quality are limited, based on opinion, anecdotal evidence and are also unsupported by scientific fact or data. For that reason, we request that the agencies remove this assumption or clearly explain that it is a concern that has not been verified with data or science, and therefor may not be a valid concern.	9	Ag - General	
			71-N	Oregon has developed water quality standards designed to protect designated uses, which in most cases include coho salmon and other endangered/threatened fish species. As referenced above, Oregon's AWQMA is designed to ensure agriculture activities do not inhibit the State from meeting those water quality standards. Water quality standards are required to protect designated uses, fish. Therefore, Oregon's program adequately addresses agriculture activities to ensure the protection of fish species, including coho salmon.	9	Ag - General	
			71-O	Most ambient water quality monitoring in region reporting fair to excellent water quality. Sites with poor condition are not due to ag activities.	9	Ag - General	
			71-P	The AWQMP Processes and Enforcement Mechanisms Satisfies CZARA and the 6217(g) Management Measures. ... Area Plans consist of voluntary measures and strategic goals; area rules implement the Area Plans and are ODA's backstop authority to ensure compliance with the AWQMA... Today, each of Oregon's coastal agriculture water quality plans include management measures that directly reference the 6217(g) guidance and include additional goals for improving watersheds. These plans far exceed that which is required under CZARA.	10	Ag - EP&Ms	
			71-Q	While it is true that each state must have an enforceable, nonpoint source water pollution program, it is not true that individual states must meet or exceed an enforcement threshold or number of citations issued. Instead, CZARA requires that the State and its designated water quality agencies possess the regulatory authority to enforce, at a minimum, a water quality program that meet or exceed the requirements set forth in 16 U.S.C. 1455b. Furthermore, as ODA demonstrated to the agencies in Oregon's July 2013 CNPCP submission, it has used that authority to enforce AWQMP rules where necessary and appropriate.	14,15	Ag - General (Enforcement)	
			71-R	Refutes concern noted that AWQMP do not require buffers or otherh specific requirments. Notes that CZARA does not specifically require riparian buffers for ag and doing so, would be taking a "one-size-fits-all" approach that goes against the inherant flexibility CZARA provides states.	15	General - One-size-fits-all; Ag - General	
			71-S	Biennial reviews of AWQMA plans provide a tracking mechanism. According to ODA, ~18 biennial reviews are conducted annually. In addition ODA is currently creating a more formalized process for tracking program implementation and effectiveness – known as the Strategic Implementation Areas and Focus Areas processes. Also, in 2012, Oregon began an Enterprise Monitoring Initiative to maximize statewide efforts for environmental protection and restoration. This initiative will monitor waterways that pass through agriculture lands and can also be used to inform the effectiveness of the AWQMA.	16	Ag - General (tracking)	
Oregon Farm Bureau, Oregon Cattlemen's Association, Oregonians for Food and Shelter, Oregon Seed Commission, Oregon Dairy Farmers Association, Oregon Wheat Growers League	organization	3/20/14	71-T	NOAA/EPA assert: AWQMA planning and enforcement does not address "legacy" issues created by agriculture activities that are no longer occurring. Yet, neither CZARA nor the 6217(g) guidance define legacy issues or require that state CNPCPs address legacy issues. Nevertheless, OWEB invests $ to address legacy ag issues. Furthermore, Oregon has developed processes for identifying opportunities to enhance and restore watersheds, including "legacy" issues, through the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, the Oregon Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Guide, OWEB riparian restoration projects, Area Plans, and many other federal, public and private partnerships. These programs are successful due to the voluntary efforts of many Oregon agriculture landowners.	17	Ag - Legacy	unkn

(b) (6)	citizen	3/20/14	72-A	Member of the Upper Willamette & Upper Siuslaw Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Local Advisory Committees. Met annually since then with our state and local officials, the Oregon Department of Agriculture, the Department of Environmental Quality(DEQ), and East Lane (county) Soil and Water Conservation District to be advised on the current status of the management plan. The committee was instructed that our plan would be complaint driven, and compliance voluntary. I have been informed that three fines have been imposed over the last 11 years. We were also told we were not allowed to consider pesticides as a pollutant. The state still does not consider pesticides as pollutants, but considers streamside plantings to be sufficient to filter anything including pesticides. I am told they do not test the water for pesticides.	1	Ag - General; Ag - Pesticides	unkn		1
			72-B	EPA & NOAA have found that Oregon forests have adequate stream buffers for pesticides on salmon bearing streams. How was this determined? Seasonal and non-fish bearing streams have not been considered. Isn't this the water that feeds the fish-bearing streams and rivers? Stream buffers and logging practices in this state are a joke--a sad joke.	1	Forestry - Pesticides; Forestry - Riparian			
Tillamook Bay Watershed Council	organization	3/20/14	73-A	Use data to uniformly establish, prioritize, and track programmatic progress towards water quality goals. Need better effectiveness monitoring to be able to make adapative changes as needed to voluntary and other programs. Cites ag, in particular. Need better science to inform implementation targets and determine how well programs are working. (Ex. TFT's recent use of LiDAR to determine ability of buffers to produce adequate shade). Moving forward with new Ag regs without first understanding the gap between the problem and current conditions and without data-based benchmarks for chipping away at the problem will only perpetuate issues moving forward.	1, 2, 3	Monitoring - improvements needed; Ag - General	against	1	
			73-B	Focus on outcomes and support the tools that achieve progress on the ground. The loss of approximately $4 million per year in funding for on-the-ground restoration runs wholly counter to what all agree is needed on the ground.	3	Penalties - negative impacts			
			73-C	NWEA's claim that CZARA needs to be achieving WQS now is not correct. CZARA obligations may not currently require controls, but instead contemplate future actions.	4, 5	General			
			73-D	Requests that NOAA/EPA include TFT's 4/22/13 response to NWEA's March 13, 2013 to EPA Regarding Medford Permits to record. TFT's letter corrects factual and legal inaccuracies in NWEA's letter. Also should include TFT's 9/27/13 public comments to Oregon DEQ on Wilsonville's now-withdrawn water quality trading program as section III(C)(4)(d) of the Proposed Finding.	5, 6	General - Public comment			
Umpqua Watersheds, Inc.	organization	3/20/14	75-A	Suport disapproval (relunctantly)	1		for	1	
			75-B	Ecological function of the Oregon Coast Range and Cascade Range Foothills has been and continues to be severely degraded by the harvest activities associated with industrial, clear-cut logging. Look in any direction and clear cuts abound. (Up to 120 acres are allowed by the OFPA!)	1	Forestry - Clear cuts			
			75-C	Concerned about lack of riparian buffers in clear cuts and spraying.	1	Forestry - Riparian; Forestry - Clear Cuts; Forestry - Pesticides			
			75-D	Inspected recent road failure: The down hill shoulder of this mid-slope sited road had broken away in several locations, due to fill slope failure. Mud and debris flows, some recent, were much in evidence, their effect on the watershed some two or three hundred feet below, clearly discernible. This phenomenon, obviously the result of heavy rain fall on deforested and very steep slopes, has repeated itself with regularity over the years I have been roaming these hills. It is a disgrace and impacts directly on water quality. The cost to repair the failure will be borne by U.S. taxpayers through BLM & FHA.	2	Forestry - Clear cuts; Forestry Landslides; Forestry - Roads			
			75-E	Notes changes in tax law favor private timber industry and don't recoop enough $ to help local govn't. Amounts to shameless taxpayer-funded PR propaganda for timber interests. Illustration of "deliberate lack of political will to fund the appropriate agencies and activities that are crucial to improving Oregon's degraded water quality.	2	Forestry - General			
			75-F	Points out that "NOAA noted in its fairly recent opinion about potential ESA delisting of the Coastal Coho Salmon, the benefits of such riparian restorations, although worthwhile, were being rapidly outstripped by the effects of logging in the uplands. Nothing has changed."	3	Forestry - General; Forestry - Riparian			
			75-G	Recognizes that disapproval will have finanical consequences for 319 that their organization and others benefit from but its time for state to do something.	3	Forestry - General; Penalties - Benefits			
			81-A	Notes that farmers and ranchers have installed many miles or piping for livestock watering, and many miles of streambank are planted and fenced	1	Ag-general; Ag-buffers;	Against	1	
			81-B	Pesticide Stewardship Programs, CAFO, and AQWMP already in place.	1	Ag-general; Ag-pesticides;			

(b) (6)	citizen	3/17/14	81-C	SWCDs and watershed councils are improving water quality in Oregon.	1	General-made improvements in water quality			
			81-D	Oregon complies with CZARA and disapproval would make it difficult to improve environment.	1	Decision			
Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc.	organization	3/21/14	79-A	Disagrees with proposed decision. Additional MMs for forestry are not needed.	1	Additional MMs Not Needed	Against	1	
			79-B	Supports OFIC letter and statements they make	1	Forestry -- General			
			79-C	OFPA includes a specific mandate to the Board of Forestry to achieve and maintain water quality standards, and provides the Oregon Department of Forestry with enforcement authority. The EPA and NOAA have produced little meaningful evidence that Oregon's forest practices rules currently fail to meet these water quality and beneficial use objectives. To the contrary, there is a large body of science indicating that modern Oregon forest practices are either neutral to positive in terms of their effect on aquatic life	2	Forestry -- General			
			79-D	Oregon's forest sector has a 15-plus year history of superior voluntary riparian watershed enhancement accomplishments. Restrictions/actions proposed by the EPA and NOAA would stifle these valuable watershed improvements. Additionally, the excessive restrictions envisioned by EPA and NOAA would unintentionally smother the willing cooperative stewardship ethic common in the forest sector.	2	Forestry - Riparian			
			79-E	EPA and NOAA's intended rigid, regulatory norms—such as excessive one-size-fits-all singular distances—would stifle Oregon forest community's stewardship ethic, and thereby reduce/or end the valuable contemporary investments in watershed enhancement experienced on Oregon forestlands (since the 1998 advent of the Oregon Plan for Salmon & Watersheds)	3	General - one-size-fits all			
			80-A	100 - - is an effective nonpoint source pollution reduction program, and the State should be given credit for its success. It limits new development in urban growth boundaries where sewer and stormwater services are planned for.	1	General-made improvements to water quality	unclear		1
			80-B	Residential Areas. DEQ proposal to require all identified Designated Management Agencies (DMAs) to develop a more rigorous stormwater control program than is currently required of existing MS4 Phase II permittees (e.g., Corvallis, Bend, Medford) is not realistic or workable. The Coastal Zone listed communities, many of which are very small with extremely limited resources, cannot be expected to implement stormwater retrofit, hydromodification, and riparian protection/restoration programs.	2	New Devel			
			80-C	DEQ should consider expanding the coverage of the existing 1200C permit by lowering the acreage applicability, or using a similar approach as used in the 1200COLS permit. The 1200COLS permit was created to tackle water quality problems in the Columbia Slough and is a global discharge permit based on the 1200Z industrial permits and applied to all significant dischargers evaluated in the TMDL process.	2	New Devel			
			80-D	For sediment problems, DEQ should consider increased technical assistance and compliance and enforcement of the 1200Z industrial permits.	2	New Devel			
			80-E	DEQ should use its existing authority, expertise and permits more effectively instead of establishing a new regulatory requirement on small cities and counties that are not the main source of impairment, do not have the expertise, and cannot afford additional state-mandated programs.	2	New Devel			
			80-F	The second of three concerns for NPS controls in Oregon's coastal zone is the need for improved compliance programs and metrics to monitor agricultural sources. An overall compliance strategy for ensuring that AWQM plans and rules are adequately implemented to effectively meet TMDL load allocations and water quality standards is needed. There must be a policy and process for proactive determination of the implementation of required elements of the Agriculture Water Quality Management Plan, and an enforcement response plan to correct instances of non-compliance.	3	Ag-general			
			80-G	Oregon Department of Agriculture and Oregon DEQ's water quality monitoring programs should be specifically designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the agricultural area plans in meeting water quality standards and load allocations for water bodies with TMDLs	3	Ag-general; Monitoring-improvements needed			
			80-H	The SB 1010 process at the Department of Agriculture should be directly linked to the Oregon adopted TMDL for the river or stream stretch.	3	Ag-general			
			80-I	SB 1010 requirements stop short of addressing 'legacy' conditions related to agricultural activities, and do not require active restoration - - only removal of conditions that impairs restoration. These policy gaps must be addressed if Oregon is to meet its water quality standards.	3	Ag-general; general-need to consider other issues			

Oregon Association of Clean Water Agencies, Legaue of Oregon Cities, Special Districts Association of Oregon	organization	3/21/14	80-J	The third of three concerns is the continued efforts to link the Oregon Forest Practices Act to water quality standards outcomes. They applaud the recent collaboration between the Oregon EQC and BOF to improvement communication and share data related to water quality compliance of the Oregon FPA and to understand how FPA can be used as a tool to meet Oregon WQS.	4	Forestry-general			
			80-K	Efforts by ODF to monitor and improve forest practices should be encouraged and continued.	4	Forestry-general; Monitoring-improvements needed			
			80-L	Additional efforts are needed to address legacy road conditions and protection of non-fish bearing streams in oregon's forests.	4	Forestry-roads; Forestry-riparian			
Tillamook Board of Commissions	organization	3/21/14	82-A	Asks NOAA/EPA to give state additional time to meet remaining conditions; state has already made good progress in meeting most of conditions.	1	General-need more time		1	
			82-B	Notes ODF has been doing good work to improve WQ, riparian habitat, and road improvements. Cites # of culverts replaced and other stats.	1 and 2	Forestry-general; Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads			
			82-C	Cites ODFW study that showed many out-migrating and returning salmon to Tillamook State forest land. OR allows salmon harvest because #s are good.	2	General-salmon;			
			82-D	Asks NOAA/EPA to review Trask Study re: forestry practices and water quality that presents factual science. Our decision should be based on science.	2	Forestry-general; General-water quality			
			82-E	Notes they have been part of group of federal, state, county and private citizen group that's been working to collaborative restore fish pass in Tillamook area. Taking a novel approach and having good success.	2	General-salmon; General made improvements in water quality			
			82-F	Understand and appreciate NOAA/EPA efforts to comply with the law but ask that agencies work with them and others in collaborate way to address issues rather than take punitive action.	3	Penalties-negative impacts; Decision	Against		
(b) (6)	citizen	3/20/14	50-A	Water shortages and toxins are big concerns as we enter "climate chaos".	1	Toxics/Pesticides; climate change			
			50-B	Very concerned about pesticide spraying on private forests--impacts humans, animals and organic farming.	1	Forestry-pesticides	Unclear		1
Audubon Society of Portland	organization	3/19/14	83-A	Support disapproval. There has been little progress on the development of Best Management Practices in order to meet the requirements of the CZARA.	1	Decision-benefit		1	
			83-B	Oregon does not have a program in place to deal with nonpoint source pollution in its coastal watersheds that is sufficient to carry out the CZARA management measures	1	General			
			83-C	Water quality standards in coastal watersheds fail to protect Oregon’s native fishes including; Coho and Chinook salmon, Cutthroat, Summer and Winter Steelhead.	1	Salmon-need more protection; General-fails to meet WQS/uses			
			83-D	DEQ is not protecting our waters sufficiently to ensure our fish are free from toxic contamination, and that our rivers are not protected enough so we can swim in all of our watersheds	1	Salmon-need more protection			
			83-E	ODF and ODA's pesticide use programs fail to control polluted runoff from logging, in Type N streams, and cattle operations.	1	Ag-pesticides; Ag-buffers; Ag-general			
			83-F	Riparian buffers are insufficient to protect water quality.	1	Ag-buffers			
			83-G	SB1010s are inadequate to protect water quality or improve habitat conditions.	1	Ag-general; general-need to improve water quality			
			83-H	The logging of unstable slopes and Type N stream created polluted runoff and the existing logging road network is also source of sediment.	1	forestry-riparian; forestry-landslides; forestry-roads			
			83-I	Older septic systems create NPS.	1	OSDS; forestry-general			
			83-J	Voluntary efforts to protect water quality and habitat have been dwarfed by the lack of rules to protect water quality.	2	General-voluntary approaches; General-need to improve water quality			
			83-K	No rules in place to protect ecological function and processes on industrial timber or agricultural lands	2	general			
			83-L	Do not believe that Oregon has in place a program to adequately protect riparian zones that are critical to maintaining cold clean water essential to the recovery and health of our native aquatic species	2	Forestry-buffers; Ag-buffers; General-water			
			83-M	Watershed council completed a herbicide monitoring program found runoff from all sources of applications – road side use, and agricultural and forestry operation. While they may have applied it correctly there was still run-off and the rules were ineffective to truly protect water quality	2	General-need to improve water quality; forestry-pesticides; ag-pesticides			

			84-A	OAN worked to develop AWQMA and plans and believes ODA/DEQ are coordinating well to ensure continued integrity of the AWQMP and the resultant Area Plans which provide the state with the tools and an inherent adaptive approach to properly address non-point source pollution.	2	Ag-general		1
			84-B	Believes the state has 1) programs in place to meet ag conditions, and 2) ensures wqs/uses are being met.	3	Ag-general		
			84-C	25% of CNP is ag land, but less than 1% is in use other than pasture or hay. Therefore, there is little opportunity for soil disturbance or nutrient loading from traditional row crop fertilizers.	3	Ag-general		
			84-D	Under the AWQMP, ODA implements site-specific and site-capable controls to both resolve existing sources and prevent future opportunities for pollution. Such an approach is reflected in the Area Plans today	3	Ag-general		
			84-E	The focus of CZARA is not the use of specific measures identified in the 6217(g) guidance, but rather the design and implementation of appropriate measures – regardless of form - that can be developed and applied to ultimately achieve measurable beneficial results.	3	General-problems with CZARA		
			84-F	Congress specifically required that such measures could only be implemented so long as they are "economically achievable."	4	General-problems with CZARA		
			84-G	NOAA/EPA didn't provide any proof for allegation that water quality impairments from ag are "widespread"--only pointed to NMFS recent listings for Coho salmon and draft recovery plans but neither of these documents appear to support such a conclusion and certainly not one which would characterize agricultural activities as presenting concerns of "widespread" impairment. NMFS reports do not specify specific land use as a culprit for need for rip. buffers.	4	Ag-general; General-salmon;		
			84-H	Does not agree with allegation that AWQMA enforcement is weak. Notes that AWQMPs lay out porcess for which enforcement actions are taken. Any reduction or withdraw of Section 319 funds will only serve to diminish ODA's abilities to take enforcement action, not increase them	5	Ag- general		
			84-I	Refutes claim that AWQMPs are too vague and do not include specific BMP requirements. Neither CZARA nor the 6217(g) guidance prescribes the AWQMP's adoption of specific management measures.	5 and 6	Ag-general		
			84-J	Disagrees with allegation that AWQMP are only focused on impaired areas. Actions and WQS developed for impairments can be the goalpost for restoration and protection.	6	Ag-general; general-water quality		
			84-K	Disagrees with allegation that AWQMPs are not addressing legacy issues. Nothing within CZARA indicates Congress ever intended that the States consider "legacy" issues nor is there any requirement to address such issues under the 6217(g) guidance	6	Ag-general		
Oregon Assoc. of Nurseries	organization	3/20/14	84-L	We believe that the continued successful implementation of the program must rely on local management experiences, both currently and in the future, which will inform how to craft the most appropriate regulatory standards. This process of creating ever improving standards of course will come from the existing adaptive management, outcome-based approach within each of the Area Plans.	7	General		
			85-A	Support disapproval	1	Decision		1
			85-B	Concerne with water quality, toxics, deforestation and fisheries health	1	General - fails to meet wqs/uses		
			85-C	FPA, Right to Forest and Pesticide Pre-emption laws have led to water quality impairments/poisoning in Rogue/Umpqua.	1	Forestry- General; Forestry -- pesticides		
			85-D	Coastal watersheds are impaired due to state govn't corruption and control by forest and chemical industry. Cites 2 examples of how EPA has gotten involved with two problems in OR (OR Health Authority's Hwy 36 investigation and Curry County airial spraying poisoning)	2	Forestry - pesticides		
(b) (6)	citizen	3/20/14	85-E	Supports Beyond Toxics Comments.	2	Forestry - pesticides		
	organization		57-B	Program guidance mirrors the statute in requiring theat states demonstrate the use of additional management measures when needed to meet water quality standards and protect beneficial uses.	7	General -- need to consider other issues	for	1
			57-C	The Federal Agencies expect the implementation of both the management measures and additional management measures in a reasonable period of time.	8	General -- need to consider other issues		

57-D	Oregon has repeatedly submitted a coastal nonpoint program that EPA and NOAA have repeatedly refused to approve, in large part because it did not include adequate regulation of forest practices in the form of additional management measures.	9	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads				
57-E	Fully agrees with EPA and NOAA findings that Oregon has failed to develop and implement additional management measures for foresry and so has failed to submit an approvable program under CZARA.	12	Forestry -- General				
57-F	Oregon's voluntary and regulatory forest practices programs do not sufficiently protect water quality or designated beneficial uses.	12	Forestry -- General				
57-G	Oregon's forest practices program improperly equates compliance with forest practices regulations with compliance with water quality standards.	13	General -- water quality; Monitoring -- improvements needed; Forestry -- General				
57-H	ODEQ has failed to use its authority to override ODF's inadequate forest practices in order to bring compliance with water quality standards	13	General -- water quality; Forestry -- General				
57-I	Failure to protect water quality from impacts due to roads, buffers, and logging on steep/unstable slopes	15	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads				
57-J	Effectiveness of the overall system of riparian management zones in maintaining sufficiently low turbidity is diminished at a watershed scale due to inadequate buffers in headwater basins.	17	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; Forestry -- riparian				
57-K	Clearcutting riparian areas around streams increases the probability of debris flows and sediment delivery to streams due to the accumulation of debris.	18	Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- clear cuts	20	49	15	84
57-L	Riparian buffers in Oregon's rules do not sufficiently prevent the warming of streams that accompanies loss of canopy cover, do not sufficiently filter nutrients and sediment from surface waters draining through riparian buffers, and do not protect streams from debris flows and landslides.	20	Forestry -- riparian				
57-M	The science is overwhelming: Oregon's riparian buffer and steep slope loggigng rules are insufficient to protect water quality and all designated beneficial uses.	20	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry landslides				
57-N	The construction, use, maintenance, and existence of logging roads detrimentally affects stream health and aquatic habitat by increasing sediment delivery and stream turbidity.	20	Forestry -- roads				
57-O	Oregon's forest practices rules impose generic BMPs and do not use pertinent water quality data to drive road management decisions; in fact they are precisely the kinds of BMPs that have been shown to be inadequate and ineffective at protecting water quality and beneficial uses.	22	General -- water quality; Forestry -- roads				

57-P	Oregon forest practices regulations applicable to forest roads consistently prioritize logging over protection of water quality.	23	General -- water quality; Forestry -- roads
57-Q	Oregon's road location rule does not require operators to eliminate or avoid water quality problems; rather, it simply requires them to minimize risk. EPA and NOAA cannot approve Oregon's CNPCP component for forest roads simply based on rules that require operators to minimize the risk to waters of the state.	23-24	General -- water quality; Forestry -- roads
57-R	Oregon's forest road rules are so loaded with vague, ambiguous, precatory, and conditional language that they can afford EPA and NOAA no rational basis for concluding that they ensure protection of water quality and designated beneficial uses in Oregon's coastal areas.	24	Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads
57-S	EPA and NOAA cannot rely on Oregon's enforcement authority where enforcement most likely only occurs *after* damage to water quality occurs. OAR 629-625 rules generally mean that so long as operators are not harming wter quality they are in complance with the rule.	24	Forestry -- General
57-T	Oregon's wet weather road use rule's purpose is "to reduce the delivery of ifine sediment to streams caused by the use of forest roads during wet periods that may adversely affect downstream water quaility in Type F or Type D streams," is designed to reduce delivery of fine sediment, but not esigned to elimate the elivery of fine sediment or to ensure that such delivery does not impair water quality.	25	Forestry -- roads
57-U	Oregon road rules lack a requirement to bring existing, inactive logging roads and other forest roads up to a standard that effectiely prevents water quality problems. This resultes in many forest roads which are not currently being used for logging falling through the regulatory cracks and continuing to have a negative impact on water quality.	26	Forestry -- roads
57-V	Implementation of BMPs without reference to and monitoring of applicable water quality standards -- including the protection of designated beneficial uses -- is simply inadequate to protect Oregon streams.	27	General -- water quality; Monitoring -- improvements needed; Forestry -- General
57-W	Despite EPA's and NOAA's telling Oregon for over a decade that its forest practices programs are not sufficiently protecting water quality, and despite ample and relevant science demonstrating that clear-cutting and other logging practices in Oregon generate nonpoint source pollution that harms water quality, Oregon substantially increased the amount of clear-cutting allowed in North Coast state forests.	28	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- clear cuts
57-X	EPA and NOAA state that legacy effiects of agriculture (denuded riparian areas, damage to natural stream morphology, eroding streambanks, etc...) are not addressed though existing regulatory tools, but have concluded tht agriculture plans are a regulatory mechanism to address past actions that are the primary cause of eroding streambanks.	34	Ag -- legacy; Ag -- EP& M's
57-Y	ODA's enforcement authority excludes most of Oregon's agricultural nonpoint source contributions, particularly its contribution to temperature in Oregon's streams from lack of shade and from exces sedimentation.	35	Ag -General; Ag -- EP&M's

57-Z	Oregon has repeatedly relied on the TMDL program to purportedly demonstrate to the federal agencies that it has a plan in place to control nonpoint source pollution in coastal watersheds. EPA cannot rely on these assertions given Oregon's own failure to use the TMDL program to bring nonpoint sources into compliance with load allocations established in the TMDLs.	36	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; Ag -- General
57-AA	DEQ has issued NPDES permits in the Rogue River Basin on the assumption that nonpoint sources will contribute zero heat load, but made a completely contrary assumption when it allwoed the City of Medford to plant trees on agricultural lands in lieu of directly reducing the thermal load in its discharge. This contrary assumption undermines any suggestion that Oregon relies on the load allocations established for nonpoint sources in its temperature TMDLs to protect riparian vegation sufficient to meet water quality standards.	37	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; Ag -- General
57-BB	Approvable state programs are required to assess over time the success of the management measures in reducing pollution loads and improving water quality. Because it has not identified the practices that constitute Oregon's version of meeting management measures, it would be impossible for the state to ascertain whether the managment meaures are in place and whether they have been successful in reducing pollutant loads sufficiently to avoid the need for additional managment measures.	37	General -- need to consider other issues; Ag -- General
57-CC	Oregon water quality standards and designated uses require the implementation of additional management measures. Given that in almost all instances, an allocation to all nonpoint sources for temperature increases is zero, it is even more likely that agricuture is currently contributing to violations of temperature standards and therefore requires additional managment measures.	39	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- need to consider other issues; Ag - General
57-DD	EPA and NOAA found that the last of the agricultural plans was put in place by ODA in October 2007. The fact that the plans and rules have been in place for such a long time should suggest that Oregon can point to their widespread success in addressing the conditions on agricultural lands that have caused and contributed to violations of water quality standards. In fact, they cannot.	40-41	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; Ag -- General
57-EE	ODA's most recent new efforts to address agricultural water quality are inadquate to meet CZARA management measures and additional management measures that are needed. None of the ODA basin rules incorporates additional management measures as needed to meet the zero load allocations established in the existing temperature TMDLs for Oregon coastal watersheds.	41	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- need to consider other issues; Ag - General
57-FF	Bear Creek cannot be held up as an example of how Oregon has a program to control agricultural nonpoint source pollution because it is primarily an example of how unique circumstances can pressure nonpoint sources into taking significant action. Absent those circumstances, the actions will not occur.	46	General - voluntary approaches; Ag -- General
57-GG	Oregon's management measures for pesticides are not adequate to meet water quality sandards including full support of desingated uses in Oregon and additional management measures are required.	47	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; Toxics/Pesticides; Forestry -- pesticides; Ag -- Pesticides
57-HH	Despite the lack of any additional ODA rules beyond the EPA pesticide labels, which have been demonstrated to be inadequate for protection of threatened coho, EPA and NOAA have not made any findings on the adequacy of Oregon's program to protect water quality and designated uses from pesticides applied to agricultural lands.	49	Toxics/Pesticides: Salmon -- need more protection

57-II	The federal agencies praise Oregon's Water Quality Pesticide Management Plan, which purportedly uses water monitoring data to drive so-called adaptive management actions, but the state does little monitoring of pesticides with which to make this work and there is no evidence it collects any data in coastal watersheds.	49	Monitoring -- improvements needed: Toxics/Pesticides
57-JJ	Oregon ignores many of its standards and data when it develops its 303d lists with the effect that data are not translated into impaired waters listings with any regularity.	49	General -- water quality
57-KK	Oregon's CNPCP fails to identify land uses and critical coastal areas that will require additional management measures to attain and maintain water quality standards because it relies on a flawed Clean Water Act section 303d listing process to identify impaired streams.	50	General -- water quality; General -- need to consider other issues
57-LL	EPA and NOAA guidance urges states to rely on their 303d list for purposes of CZARA, but the problem with doing so in Oregon is that the DEQ has, for many years, failed to meet the requirements set out in federal regulations to "assemble and evaluate all existing and readily available water quality related data and information to develop the list."	52	General -- water quality; General -- need to consider other issues
57-MM	DEQ does not use its nonpoint source assessments to develop its 303d lists, contrary to EPA listing guidance and EPA/NOAA CZARA guidance.	52	General -- water quality; General -- need to consider other issues
57-NN	Oregon fails to identify land uses causing or threatening water quality impairments by ignoring a wide variety of technical information available to identify land uses that consistently cause or contribute to violations of water quality standards in coastal watersheds and harm designated uses.	53	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- Salmon; General -- need to consider other issues
57-OO	Oregon does not use TMDLs to identify critical coastal areas as required for approval programs under CZARA.	58	General -- need to consider other issues
57-PP	Oregon's TMDL program changes numeric criteria for temperature bypassing section 303c federal approval and producing criteria in excess of safe levels for cold-water species.	59	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- salmon; General -- need to consider other issues
57-QQ	Oregon's TMDL program fails to result in changes to nonpoint source controls sufficient to meet load allocations established in TMDLs and necessary to meet water quality standards.	61	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- need to consider other issues
57-RR	Most Oregon coastal watershed TMDLs establish load allocations for nonpoint sources but their associated water quality management plans fail to support an effective coastal nonpoint source pollution control program	62	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- need to consider other issues
57-SS	Despite nearly all of the TMDLs for temperature in Oregon's coastal watersheds' having established a load allocation of zero heat increase for nonpoint sources, the load allocations have not been used to determine minimum riparian buffer width, height, and density to achieve the load allocations.	69	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- need to consider other issues; Forestry -- riparian
57-TT	Oregon TMDLs fail to evaluate whether CZARA management measures are sufficient to meet load allocations for nonpoint sources and fail to establish additional management measures needed to meet load allocations for nonpoint sources.	70	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- need to consider other issues
57-UU	Oregon fails to systematically address violations of water quality standards caused by excess sedimentation.	76	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- need to consider other issues
57-VV	The current status of listed aquatic species in Oregon, and Oregon's failure to make a dent in recovery efforts for those species, demonstrate that Oregon's water quality protection programs are inadequate and not meeting CZARA standards.	81	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- Salmon; General -- need to consider other issues
57-WW	EPA and NOAA have violated the law by failing to withhold CWA and CZMA grant money from Oregon since 1998. EPA's and NOAA's "conditional approval" of Oregon's CNPCP contravenes CZARA and cannot be maintained.	81	General

NWEA	3/20/14	57-WW	EPA and NOAA have violated the law by failing to withhold CWA and CZMA grant money from Oregon since 1998. EPA's and NOAA's "conditional approval" of Oregon's CNPCP contravenes CZARA and cannot be maintained.	81

Comment Code	Summary Main Comments	Pg. #	Categorey of Comment
63-B	Concerned with logging impacts, particularly from clearcutting and resultant hillside erosion, which may pollute our drinking water spring. We had severe clearcutting around our private forest and this caused substantial loss of river quality.	1	Forestry - General; Forestry - landslides
67-A	Supports disapproval although regrets loss of funding.	1	Forestry - General
67-E	Additional MMs needed for foresty such as what is described on pg. 7-12 of proposed findings.	1	Forestry - General
67-F	Used Salmonberry River in north Coast range as prime example of impacts.	2	Forestry - General
67-G	Refutes OR's claims the land use laws provide sufficient protection… even if they've helped prevent sprawl, still need to control forest industry that is damaging remote watersheds	11	Forestry - General
70-C	Beyond Toxics report on pesticide/herbicide use in forestry shows that FPA lacks any program to protect Oregon streams and their beneficial uses (see report attached). Requires no pesticide buffer on non-fish streams even though neighboring states (WA, ID) require 25ft buffers. In non-fish bearing streams, amphibians and crawfish are affected by pesticide application	2	Forestry - General; Forestry - Pesticides; Forestry - Riparian

77-F	Oregon's Forest Practices Act establishes a dynamic program that responds promptly and deliberately to environmental issues as they arise. … With respect to water quality, the Oregon Forest Practices Act (the "OFPA") mandates that the Board of Forestry adopt standards for forest practices that "provide for the overall maintenance" of "water resources, including but not limited to sources of domestic drinking water." ORS 527.710(2)(b). The OFPA also charges the Board of Forestry with establishing "best management practices and other rules applying to forest practices as necessary to insure that to the maximum extent practicable nonpoint source discharges of pollutants resulting from forest operations on forestlands do not impair the achievement and maintenance of water quality standards established by the Environmental Quality Commission." ORS 527.765(1). Note that this language hews closely to the CZARA requirement that the CNPCP include additional management measures necessary to "attain or maintain applicable water quality standards." ... Forest Practice Rules are fully enforceable.	4, 5, 6	Forestry - General; Forestry - Legal
77-G	FPA requires BMP monitoring with adaptive feedback. Board has charged ODF with pesticide use monitoring, OAR 629-620-0700(1), and landslides and public safety monitoring. OAR 629-623-0000(4). In each circumstance, the Board will consider the monitoring results and take appropriate action, including when necessary, development of new forest practice rules. Cites example of 2002 road runoff drainage study that led to improved rules. FP Rules have evolved over time.	5, 6	Forestry - General; Forestry - Legal

75-E	Notes changes in tax law favor private timber industry and don't recoop enough $ to help local govn't. Amounts to shameless taxpayer-funded PR propaganda for timber interests. Illustration of "deliberate lack of political will to fund the appropriate agencies and activities that are crucial to improving Oregon's degraded water quality.	2	Forestry - General
75-F	Points out that "NOAA noted in its fairly recent opinion about potential ESA delisting of the Coastal Coho Salmon, the benefits of such riparian restorations, although worthwhile, were being rapidly outstripped by the effects of logging in the uplands. Nothing has changed."	3	Forestry - General; Forestry - Riparian
75-G	Recognizes that disapproval will have finanical consequences for 319 that their organization and others benefit from but its time for state to do something.	3	Forestry - General; Penalties - Benefits
79-B 79-C	Supports OFIC letter and statements they make OFPA includes a specific mandate to the Board of Forestry to achieve and maintain water quality standards, and provides the Oregon Department of Forestry with enforcement authority. The EPA and NOAA have produced little meaningful evidence that Oregon's forest practices rules currently fail to meet these water quality and beneficial use objectives. To the contrary, there is a large body of science indicating that modern Oregon forest practices are either neutral to positive in terms of their effect on aquatic life	1 2	Forestry -- General Forestry -- General
57-D	Oregon has repeatedly submitted a coastal nonpoint program that EPA and NOAA have repeatedly refused to approve, in large part because it did not include adequate regulation of forest practices in the form of additional management measures.	9	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads

57-E	Fully agrees with EPA and NOAA findings that Oregon has failed to develop and implement additional management measures for foresry and so has failed to submit an approvable program under CZARA.	12	Forestry -- General
57-F	Oregon's voluntary and regulatory forest practices programs do not sufficiently protect water quality or designated beneficial uses.	12	Forestry -- General
57-G	Oregon's forest practices program improperly equates compliance with forest practices regulations with compliance with water quality standards.	13	General -- water quality; Monitoring -- improvements needed; Forestry -- General
57-H	ODEQ has failed to use its authority to override ODF's inadequate forest practices in order to bring compliance with water quality standards	13	General -- water quality; Forestry -- General
57-I	Failure to protect water quality from impacts due to roads, buffers, and logging on steep/unstable slopes	15	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads
57-S	EPA and NOAA cannot rely on Oregon's enforcement authority where enforcement most likely only occurs *after* damage to water quality occurs. OAR 629-625 rules generally mean that so long as operators are not harming wter quality they are in complance with the rule.	24	Forestry -- General
57-V	Implementation of BMPs without reference to and monitoring of applicable water quality standards -- including the protection of designated beneficial uses -- is simply inadequate to protect Oregon streams.	27	General -- water quality; Monitoring -- improvements needed; Forestry -- General

57-W	Despite EPA's and NOAA's telling Oregon for over a decade that its forest practices programs are not sufficiently protecting water quality, and despite ample and relevant science demonstrating that clear-cutting and other logging practices in Oregon generate nonpoint source pollution that harms water quality, Oregon substantially increased the amount of clear-cutting allowed in North Coast state forests.	28	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- clear cuts

Comment Code	Summary Main Comments	Pg. #	Categorey of Comment
4-C	· Oregon needs to prioritize clean water (even for smallest streams) and guard against human-made landslides.	1	Forestry-riparian; landslides; pesticides
13-B	· Supportive of 3 key areas where Oregon hasn't met program requirements (forestry--all elements, OSDS, and new devel) and asks us to continue to work with OR to address those issues.	1	New Devel; OSDS; Forestry-riparian; landslides; pesticides; roads
14-D	· ODF is working to strengthen forest rules for riparian protection but face political challenges that require thoughtful science to bring along. Maintaining support of forest industry is important for water quality protection and will take longer than Spring 2014.	2	Forestry-riparian; General-need more time
20-B	Additional riparian setbacks would only hurt logging industry and drive up price of lumber.	1	Forestry-riparian
24-C	· BOF/ODF have had proposals to improve stream protection come before than but to date, have failed to take action.	1	Forestry-riparian
28-B	· Very narrow or non-existent buffers along streams that flow into Siletz. Clear cut to banks and airial spraying over cuts.	1	Forestry-riparian; Forestry-clear cuts; Forestry-pesticides
30-E	Oregon must increase protection of riparian areas for small and medium fish and non-fish streamsand high-risk landslide areas.	2	Forestry-riparian; Forestry-landslides
30-K	· 20 ft buffers ODF mandates on drinking water streams are too narrow to w/stand blowdowns and provide much protection from airial spraying.	4	Forestry-riparian
30-L	· Complete lack of buffers on non-fish streams make sedimentation a constant impairment/risk.	4	Forestry-riparian
30-M	· The drinking water for our communities routinely have high levels of known carcinogens, trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids. These high levels are caused when excess sediment that enters public waters from logging roads and inadequate riparian buffers reacts with disinfectants required to treat the water.	4	Forestry-General; Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads

35-I	·Oregon does not have a workable program that meets the requirements of EPA and NOAA for a coastal nonpoint pollution program. Piecemeal approaches such as promises to increase TMDL's, tighten Department of Forestry riparian rules and decommission legacy roads, are insufficient as basic management measures to grant Oregon approval for a nonpoint program.	4	New devel; Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads; General-water quality
35-J	·NOAA/EPA need to require Oregon to provide not only a solid framework of basic management measures, but also a detailed and concrete list of additional management measures to actually protect riparian areas, and provide substantially increased protections for fertilizer, herbicide and pesticide applications near fish-bearing and non-fish bearing streams.	4	Forestry-riparian; Forestry-pesticides
40-A	· Supports proposed disapproval. Significant clear cuttings occuring in "protected" (Clear Lake) watershed w/ minimal (10 ft) buffers between waterways (including drinking water source) and homes.	1	Decision; Forestry-clear cutting; Forestry-riparian
43-E	Clear that OR forest practices are far behind CA and WA. There are signifant differences in setbacks, notification or application process and consequences for non-compliance rather than just passing the consequences on to future generations.	2	Forestry-General; Forestry-riparian
44-D	·Areas where program improvement needed that could actually work to control polluted runoff from logging would be protection of riparian areas for small and medium streams (fish and non-fish bearig), including sufficient riparian buffers for application of pesticides along non-fish streams; treating old logging roads often built on fill that are leaching sediment, protection of high-risk landslide areas from cuts	1	Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads; Forestry-landslides

46-C	· State is not doing enough to prevent polluted runoff from forestry--especially related totimber harvesting and riparian protection (fish and nonfish-bearing streams and for pesticide application).	2	Forestry-General; Forestry-riparian; Forestry-pesticides
46-H	Oregon doesn't have programs in place to protect and restore riparian areas needed to maintain cool stream temperatures and habitat, protect and restore channel conditions from modification, protect and restore wetlands, identify where more protection is needed to protect important habitat for species, identify where more pollution control is needed to protect uses, monitor water quality and use water quality data to improve pollution controls, monitor pesticide use and impacts, assess whether pollution controls are reducing pollution and improving water quality, link the enforcement agencies and process with other agencies, or use enforcement when voluntary actions are not adequate to protect water quality.	7	Forestry-riparian; Ag-riparian; Hydromod; Wetlands; Monitoring-improvements needed; Toxics/Pesticides; General-voluntary approaches
48-A	· State has gotten by with an ineffective piecemeal approach, including promises to tighten TMDL's, increase the size of riparian buffers under Department of Forestry rules for logging on private lands, decommission and/or restore so-called legacy roads in forestlands, and craft a voluntary approach to onsite septic leakage. All of these things are necessary, but none are remotely sufficient to solve the problems facing coastal communities.	1	General-need to improve water quality; Forestry-riparian buffers; Forestry-roads; OSDS
48-F	· Drinking waters are surrounded by private forest land or are below forest operations. 20ft buffers on fish-bearing streams do not protect from sedimentation and pesticide/herbicide use.	2	Forestry-riparian
48-I	Lack of sufficient protection for non-fish bearing streams is significant issue. Agree with NOAA/EPA that add MM for better rip protection of non-fish bearing streams is needed.	3	Forestry-riparian

48-J	The 20-foot riparian buffer where required is completely ineffective, and subject to blowdown in even a moderate coastal storm.	3	Forestry-riparian
49-E	Insufficient riparian buffers for fish and non-fish bearing streams contributes to polluted runoff and doesn't have programs in place to adequately protect and restore riparian areas needed to maintian cool stream temperatures and habitat.	1	Forestry-riparian
55-J	Protection of riparian areas: ODF's own study, Ripstream, documents that harvesting on private forest land carries a significant risk (estimated at 40%) that harvesting will result in violations of Oregon's water quality standard for protecting cold water.	4	Forestry-riparian
55-K	In theroy, EQC has legal authority to require changes that will provide protection to streams, the practical reality is that there is no certainty whatsoever that there will be any additional riparian protection provided. EQC/DEQ can petition BOF but they can take 2 yrs to act and even then, could decide no to do anything.	4	Forestry-riparian
55-N	Supports Beyond Toxics Comments. Need mandatory spray buffers and vegetated riparian zone. Buffers around streams.	6	Forestry-pesticides; Forestry-riparian
56-E	NMFS recommeded buffers range from 150-300ft far above 20ft that OR has (only for fish-bearing).	3	Forestry-riparian
58-H	Cites numerous studies about inadequacy of OFPA and how its worse than federal and neighboring states.	7 to 11	Forestry-clear cut; Forestry-landslides, Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads
63-D	Inadequate protection and restoration of riparian areas	1	Forestry-riparian
80-L	Additional efforts are needed to address legacy road conditions and protection of non-fish bearing streams in oregon's forests.	4	Forestry-roads; Forestry-riparian
82-B	Notes ODF has been doing good work to improve WQ, riparian habitat, and road improvements. Cites # of culverts replaced and other stats.	1 and 2	Forestry-general; Forestry-riparian; Forestry-roads

83-H	The logging of unstable slopes and Type N stream created polluted runoff and the existing logging road network is also source of sediment.	1	forestry-riparian; forestry-landslides; forestry-roads
57-D	Oregon has repeatedly submitted a coastal nonpoint program that EPA and NOAA have repeatedly refused to approve, in large part because it did not include adequate regulation of forest practices in the form of additional management measures.	9	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads
57-I	Failure to protect water quality from impacts due to roads, buffers, and logging on steep/unstable slopes	15	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads
57-J	Effectiveness of the overall system of riparian management zones in maintaining sufficiently low turbidity is diminished at a watershed scale due to inadequate buffers in headwater basins.	17	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; Forestry -- riparian
57-K	Clearcutting riparian areas around streams increases the probability of debris flows and sediment delivery to streams due to the accumulation of debris.	18	Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- clear cuts
57-L	Riparian buffers in Oregon's rules do not sufficiently prevent the warming of streams that accompanies loss of canopy cover, do not sufficiently filter nutrients and sediment from surface waters draining through riparian buffers, and do not protect streams from debris flows and landslides.	20	Forestry -- riparian
57-M	The science is overwhelming: Oregon's riparian buffer and steep slope loggigng rules are insufficient to protect water quality and all designated beneficial uses.	20	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry landslides
57-SS	Despite nearly all of the TMDLs for temperature in Oregon's coastal watersheds' having established a load allocation of zero heat increase for nonpoint sources, the load allocations have not been used to determine minimum riparian buffer width, height, and density to achieve the load allocations.	69	General -- fails to meet wqs/uses; General -- need to consider other issues; Forestry -- riparian

Comment Code	Summary Main Comments	Pg. #	Categorey of Comment
61-A	Supports disapproval	1	Foresty - Roads; Forestry - Landslides
63-B	Concerned with logging impacts, particularly from clearcutting and resultant hillside erosion, which may pollute our drinking water spring. We had severe clearcutting around our private forest and this caused substantial loss of river quality.	1	Forestry - General; Forestry - landslides
67-B	Oregon does not have a program in place to control nonpoint pollution sufficiently to meet the additional CZARA MM needed to attain/maintain wqs and protect designated uses, particularly due to logging on private lands.	1	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Landslides
77-J	We disagree that the FPA is not protective of high-risk landslide prone areas. in evaluating the results from Turner et. al. (2010), it is misleading to focus only on landslide density relationships. Rather, it is important to also consider the total number of landslides triggered during major storms. While landslide densities have been shown to be higher in steep terrain with young forest stands, the proportion of this area across mountainous terrain is potentially very low, so that potential increases in sediment delivery to public resources from landslides triggered in these areas is also proportionately small. ... Channel alterations from debris flows are a naturalhabitat-forming process and not necessarily negative.	14, 15, 16	Forestry - Landslides

77-K	EPA argues that Oregon must have additional management measures for forestry to protect HLHLs, to maintain good water quality, and to ensure that designated uses are protected. However, EPA does not offer any objective evidence that these additional measures are necessary. We respectfully suggest that EPA consider a landscape-scale view over long timeframes as the proper context for evaluating whether water quality standards and designated uses are impaired or attained. Disturbance and recovery processes are an essential part of these landscape-driven forest ecosystems.	16, 17	Forestry - Landslides
77-L	From a strictly legal perspective, the Agencies have produced no evidence (much less, substantial evidence), that landslides resulting from forest management activities are causing water quality standard exceedances, or negatively impacting aquatic life more than landslides do under background conditions. Without more, a decision to disapprove Oregon's CNPCP would not withstand judicial review.	17	Forestry - Landslides

Comment Code	Summary Main Comments	Pg. #	Categorey of Comment
67-B	Oregon does not have a program in place to control nonpoint pollution sufficiently to meet the additional CZARA MM needed to attain/maintain wqs and protect designated uses, particularly due to logging on private lands.	1	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Landslides
77-M	Roads: The Agencies "remain concerned" (about forest roads delivering sediment into streams) without citing a single source indicating a problem exists, without citing any water quality standard or beneficial use the rules fail to protect, indeed without citing a single reason for concern.	17	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Legal
77-N	Roads: There have been significant new rule revisions in 2002 and 2003, and broad success under the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, all detailed thoroughly in the State's July submission to the Agencies.	17	Forestry - Roads

77-O	The agencies allege that the state has not provided “a commitment to exercise its back-up authority to require implementation of additional management measures for forestry roads, as needed.” This is ludicrous. The rule revisions in 2002 and 2003 indicate that the OFPA is working precisely as it should, and evidence a continuing commitment by the Board of Forestry to implement additional management measures as needed. One would be hard-pressed to imagine better evidence of the Board’s commitment. If there were additional data indicating that forest roads continue to “cause or contribute significantly to a degradation of coastal waters”—an issue ODF is actively monitoring under OAR 629-635-0110—then the Board would initiate a new rulemaking, as it has done repeatedly in the past.	17	Forestry - Roads

77-P	The Agencies also assert that the State has not provided sufficient data to the Agencies to document effectiveness of voluntary efforts under the Oregon Plan. The Agencies suggest that an extensive (and expensive) inventory and reporting program for forest roads is necessary “to determine the extent of forestry road miles not meeting current road standards within the nonpoint management area." Here, the Agencies presume a problem exists (again, without citation to a single source) until the State can prove otherwise. However, nothing in CZARA requires that a state prove a negative. Additionally, data shows that salmon stocks are recovering since the 1990s. Finally, we are not aware of any scientific evidence indicating that habitat and water quality conditions have materially improved in Washington State due to implementation of their road maintenance and abandonment program	18	Forestry - Roads
77-Q	Alleging that Oregon's rules are insufficient without reason, and without any support, is the definition of arbitrary, and a disapproval action on this basis would not survive even cursory judicial scrutiny.	19	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Legal

75-D	Inspected recent road failure: The down hill shoulder of this mid-slope sited road had broken away in several locations, due to fill slope failure. Mud and debris flows, some recent, were much in evidence, their effect on the watershed some two or three hundred feet below, clearly discernible. This phenomenon, obviously the result of heavy rain fall on deforested and very steep slopes, has repeated itself with regularity over the years I have been roaming these hills. It is a disgrace and impacts directly on water quality. The cost to repair the failure will be borne by U.S. taxpayers through BLM & FHA.	2	Forestry - Clear cuts; Forestry Landslides; Forestry - Roads
57-D	Oregon has repeatedly submitted a coastal nonpoint program that EPA and NOAA have repeatedly refused to approve, in large part because it did not include adequate regulation of forest practices in the form of additional management measures.	9	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads
57-I	Failure to protect water quality from impacts due to roads, buffers, and logging on steep/unstable slopes	15	Forestry -- General; Forestry -- riparian; Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads
57-N	The construction, use, maintenance, and existence of logging roads detrimentally affects stream health and aquatic habitat by increasing sediment delivery and stream turbidity.	20	Forestry -- roads

57-O	Oregon's forest practices rules impose generic BMPs and do not use pertinent water quality data to drive road management decisions; in fact they are precisely the kinds of BMPs that have been shown to be inadequate and ineffective at protecting water quality and beneficial uses.	22	General -- water quality; Forestry -- roads
57-P	Oregon forest practices regulations applicable to forest roads consistently prioritize logging over protection of water quality.	23	General -- water quality; Forestry -- roads
57-Q	Oregon's road location rule does not require operators to eliminate or avoid water quality problems; rather, it simply requires them to minimize risk. EPA and NOAA cannot approve Oregon's CNPCP component for forest roads simply based on rules that require operators to minimize the risk to waters of the state.	23-24	General -- water quality; Forestry -- roads
57-R	Oregon's forest road rules are so loaded with vague, ambiguous, precatory, and conditional language that they can afford EPA and NOAA no rational basis for concluding that they ensure protection of water quality and designated beneficial uses in Oregon's coastal areas.	24	Forestry -- landslides; Forestry -- roads

57-T	Oregon's wet weather road use rule's purpose is "to reduce the delivery of ifine sediment to streams caused by the use of forest roads during wet periods that may adversely affect downstream water quaility in Type F or Type D streams," is designed to reduce delivery of fine sediment, but not esigned to elimate the elivery of fine sediment or to ensure that such delivery does not impair water quality.	25	Forestry -- roads
57-U	Oregon road rules lack a requirement to bring existing, inactive logging roads and other forest roads up to a standard that effectiely prevents water quality problems. This resultes in many forest roads which are not currently being used for logging falling through the regulatory cracks and continuing to have a negative impact on water quality.	26	Forestry -- roads

Comment Code	Summary Main Comments	Pg. #	Categorey of Comment
62-B	Concerned with logging impacts from pesticide/herbicide use and habitat "mistreatment". There should be no aerial spraying close to known drinking water sources.	1	Forestry - Pesticides
62-C	Need more regular monitoring of drinking water for pesticides/herbicides; designated uses and water quality standards in coastal watersheds are not protected.	1	Monitoring - Improvements needed; Forestry - Pesticides
76-A	Concerned about pesticide spraying. They have tested posititive for pesticide/herbicides even though they run an organic farm.	1	Forestry - Pesticides
76-B	Would like to incorporate many other studies/reports by reference (included links in letter)	1	Forestry - Pesticides
76-C	Supports pesticide-free buffers around schools, such as near Triangle Lake.	2	Forestry - Pesticides
69-C	Especially concerned about inadequate buffer for aerial spray pesticide application. Oregon has an inadequately small no-spray buffer zone around fish-bearing streams and no effective program to protect non-fish bearing streams.	2	Forestry - Pesticides; Forestry - Riparian
70-C	Beyond Toxics report on pesticide/herbicide use in forestry shows that FPA lacks any program to protect Oregon streams and their beneficial uses (see report attached). Requires no pesticide buffer on non-fish streams even though neighboring states (WA, ID) require 25ft buffers. In non-fish bearing streams, amphibians and crawfish are affected by pesticide application	2	Forestry - General; Forestry - Pesticides; Forestry - Riparian
70-D	Unknown risks from synergistic interactions of chemicals mixed together.	2,3	Forestry - Pesticides
70-E	Oregon has inadequate protection of fish-bearing streams and drinking water compared to neighboring states.	3	Forestry - Pesticides; Forestry - Riparian

70-G	Herbicides (e.g., Atrazine) can persist in water and can bind with soil particles, so under OR's FPA, pesticides such as atrazine are sprayed into dry channels that become active in wetter months, carrying herbicides downstream to fish.	4	Forestry - Pesticides
70-J	Oregon must develop a research program to determine if aerial application of herbicides is necessary for timber production. Oregon needs additional management measures to protect uses and water quality from pesticide drift.	5	Monitoring - Improvement needed; Forestry - Pesticides
77-R	Water quality monitoring of a type-N (non-fish bearing) forest stream during and after herbicide spray operations (applied under OFPA rules and guidelines and FIFRA/labeling regulations) shows no evidence of detrimental impacts. Nevertheless, Oregon continues to support monitoring that would identify potential problems should they arise. ... Recent monitoring has not found a problem with contemporary forest aerial herbicide spray operations; in fact just the opposite. Oregon is currently monitoring for over 100 pesticides, which will aloow the state to respond should herbicides be identified at unacceptable levels.	19, 21	Forestry - Pesticides
77-S	Since 1998 there have been significant changes in how chemicals are applied to forests under FIFRA. Findings from the Spray Drift Task Force and other research led to revisions in chemical labeling. Pesticide applicators are licensed under FIFRA and recent court rulings have further increased regulation of applicators and land owners. Oregon's Forest Practices Act rule guidelines state that applications must comply with the most stringent of requirements of either the label, or forest practice rules and guidelines.	19	Forestry - Pesticides

77-T	ODF has developed extensive guidelines for implementing the Oregon Forest Practices Act rules for herbicide applications to forest lands. See Oregon Department of Forestry, Forest Practice Rule Guidance: Chemicals and Other Petroleum Products (2009), available at http://goo.gl/uv8oIH. Also cite pesticide monitoring studies that show no significant impact.	19	Forestry - Pesticides
72-B	EPA & NOAA have found that Oregon forests have adequate stream buffers for pesticides on salmon bearing streams. How was this determined? Seasonal and non-fish bearing streams have not been considered. Isn't this the water that feeds the fish-bearing streams and rivers? Stream buffers and logging practices in this state are a joke--a sad joke.	1	Forestry - Pesticides; Forestry - Riparian
75-C	Concerned about lack of riparian buffers in clear cuts and spraying.	1	Forestry - Riparian; Forestry - Clear Cuts; Forestry - Pesticides
85-D	Coastal watersheds are impaired due to state govn't corruption and control by forest and chemical industry. Cites 2 examples of how EPA has gotten involved with two problems in OR (OR Health Authority's Hwy 36 investigation and Curry County airial spraying poisoning)	2	Forestry - pesticides
85-E	Supports Beyond Toxics Comments.	2	Forestry - pesticides

Comment Code	Summary Main Comments	Pg. #	Categorey of Comment
75-B	Ecological function of the Oregon Coast Range and Cascade Range Foothills has been and continues to be severely degraded by the harvest activities associated with industrial, clear-cut logging. Look in any direction and clear cuts abound. (Up to 120 acres are allowed by the OFPA!)	1	Forestry - Clear cuts
75-C	Concerned about lack of riparian buffers in clear cuts and spraying.	1	Forestry - Riparian; Forestry - Clear Cuts; Forestry - Pesticides
75-D	Inspected recent road failure: The down hill shoulder of this mid-slope sited road had broken away in several locations, due to fill slope failure. Mud and debris flows, some recent, were much in evidence, their effect on the watershed some two or three hundred feet below, clearly discernible. This phenomenon, obviously the result of heavy rain fall on deforested and very steep slopes, has repeated itself with regularity over the years I have been roaming these hills. It is a disgrace and impacts directly on water quality. The cost to repair the failure will be borne by U.S. taxpayers through BLM & FHA.	2	Forestry - Clear cuts; Forestry Landslides; Forestry - Roads

Comment Code	Summary Main Comments	Pg. #	Categorey of Comment
12-A	· Anti-clear cutting (doesn't believe it can be done sustainably); pro sustainable forestry.	1	Forestry-clear cutting

40-A	· Supports proposed disapproval. Significant clear cuttings occuring in "protected" (Clear Lake) watershed w/ minimal (10 ft) buffers between waterways (including drinking water source) and homes.	1	Decision; Forestry-clear cutting; Forestry-riparian
42-D	· Jetty Creek watershed provides drinking water to Rockaway Beach. 80% of watershed has been clearcut over past several years even though DEQ source water assessment noted these are steep slopes with erosive soils.	1	Forestry-clear cutting; Forestry-landslide
43-D	· Logging around Quartz Creek denuded the area. Designation of spotted owl sites and high risk areas meant nothing to operator. Hills, road failures, and on-going erosion verify the consequences of ODF's ineffective rules and laws.	1	Forestry-clear cutting; Forestry-General; Forestry-roads
53-F	Problems with FPA include restrictions on clearcuts to 120 ac by one owner (doesn't account for cumulative impacts of nearby owners)	2	Forestry-clear cutting

Comment Code	Summary Main Comments	Pg. #	Categorey of Comment
77-F	Oregon's Forest Practices Act establishes a dynamic program that responds promptly and deliberately to environmental issues as they arise. … With respect to water quality, the Oregon Forest Practices Act (the "OFPA") mandates that the Board of Forestry adopt standards for forest practices that "provide for the overall maintenance" of "water resources, including but not limited to sources of domestic drinking water." ORS 527.710(2)(b). The OFPA also charges the Board of Forestry with establishing "best management practices and other rules applying to forest practices as necessary to insure that to the maximum extent practicable nonpoint source discharges of pollutants resulting from forest operations on forestlands do not impair the achievement and maintenance of water quality standards established by the Environmental Quality Commission." ORS 527.765(1). Note that this language hews closely to the CZARA requirement that the CNPCP include additional management measures necessary to "attain or maintain applicable water quality standards." ... Forest Practice Rules are fully enforceable.	4, 5, 6	Forestry - General; Forestry - Legal
77-G	FPA requires BMP monitoring with adaptive feedback. Board has charged ODF with pesticide use monitoring, OAR 629-620-0700(1), and landslides and public safety monitoring. OAR 629-623-0000(4). In each circumstance, the Board will consider the monitoring results and take appropriate action, including when necessary, development of new forest practice rules. Cites example of 2002 road runoff drainage study that led to improved rules. FP Rules have evolved over time.	5, 6	Forestry - General; Forestry - Legal

77-M	Roads: The Agencies “remain concerned” (about forest roads delivering sediment into streams) without citing a single source indicating a problem exists, without citing any water quality standard or beneficial use the rules fail to protect, indeed without citing a single reason for concern.	17	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Legal
77-Q	Alleging that Oregon's rules are insufficient without reason, and without any support, is the definition of arbitrary, and a disapproval action on this basis would not survive even cursory judicial scrutiny.	19	Forestry - Roads; Forestry - Legal