Suggested comments for Coconino National Forest Plan Revision
Joe Shannon

Overall Impression of Coconino National Forest Plan Revision
Lacks confirmable management objectives linked to monitoring metrics. More simply; too much jargon not enough repeatable data. There is not a sense of urgency in plan implementation that climate change and out of controlled wildfires from decades of poor management and leadership has created. I could not find anything on forest closure criteria or changes in campfire regulation. For example, this year we need to keep the winter road closure in effect until the monsoons begin and stop campfire today. The new weather we have with May/June humidity's <10% dictate a new management criteria needs to be used but none is mentioned.

Also much of the recreation use and regulation is dependent on enforcement, which is near zero on the Coconino National Forest. Illegal trail building, night motorcycle riding on closed trails, and bicycling in wilderness area are very common activities because the offenders know they will not be caught. Recreational impacts are growing, but no limits are indicated by the responsible agency.

High elevation forests
Chap 2 p66 Mixed Conifer Types
FW-Veg-MC-MCFF-O

Objective 1 – Tens years following plan approval is much too slow. The Citizens of Flagstaff double taxed themselves to maybe prevent another Shultz Fire on the west of Mt.Elden. More severe conditions exist farther up-stream in the Rio DeFlag drainage,that could have similar long-term impacts on Flagstaff.

St. Clair S.B., Cavard X., and Bergeron, Y. 2013. The role of facilitation and competition in the development and resilience of aspen forests. Forest Ecology and Management. 299; 91-99.

Vankat J. 2011. Post-1935 changes in forest vegetation of Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona, USA: Part 2—Mixed conifer, spruce-fir, and quaking aspen forests. Forest Ecology and Management. 261; 326-341

Watershed
Chap 2 Page 18 FW- WtrShd-obj

There lacks any reference to management of grazers on the overall watershed plan climate change. These are two interrelated impacts that need verifiable management objectives within a 10 year metric. Aside from cattle, USFS managers need to better define elk population numbers in coordination with AZ Game and Fish.

Beschta R. L-,Donahue D.L. DellaSala D.A, Rhodes J.J., Karr J.R. O'BrienM. H., Fleischner M. and Williams C.D- 2013. Adapting to Climate Change on Western Public Lands: Addressing the Ecological Effects of Domestic, Wild, and Feral Ungulates 51:474-491.

Yongguang Z Moran S Nearing M., Campos G-, Huete A. Anthony R. Buda A. Bosch D. Gunter S., Kitchen S., McNab ., Morgan J., 2013. Extreme precipitation patterns and reductions of terrestrial ecosystem production across biomes. Journal of Geophysical research: Biogeosciences. 118; 148-157.

Maschinski J. Baggs J., Quintana-Ascencio P., Menges E., 2006. Using Population Viability Analysis to Predict the Effects of Climate Change on the Extinction Risk of an Endangered Limestone Endemic Shrub, Arizona Cliffrose. Conservation Biology. 20; 218-228.