

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/28/2016 7:00:00 AM

First name: Madeline

Last name: Fritzen

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As Environmental Studies students at Gonzaga University, our main concerns revolve around the health of the Colville National Forest. Therefore, we have selected different sections of the various alternatives that we believe would help in preserving the integrity of this natural entity. These proposals involve yielding a low timber harvest, reducing road suitability, preserving watersheds, and increasing wilderness. Many of these values align with what the native tribes in area of the Colville Forest desire in order to help preserve sacred areas. For instance, the increase in wilderness will help maintain their native tribal lands in a state that their ancestors would recognize. For further information, please see below:

*The forest management plan outlined in Alternative O of the Proposed Revised Land Management Plan for Colville National Forest is most desirable to us as Environmental Studies students because it allocates a specific portion of the forest for vegetation management, which emphasizes restoration and timber production. Alternative O maintains the current timber production numbers (Draft EIS line 18955), which is economically desirable for timber harvesters. On the other hand, timber management plans for Alternative O maintain the 21-inch upper diameter limit for live trees (Draft EIS line 1889), thus allowing for the continued presence of old growth. This allows both timber harvesters and people who wish to preserve old growth, such as tribal members to be satisfied with the timber management strategy.

*There does seem to be discrepancy between what is stated in Alternative O lines 18955-18956: "The expected timber harvest remains the same across all alternatives due to budget trends" and the estimated MMBF for each alternative. In the proposed action, the annual predicted wood sale quantity is estimated at 62 MMBF (line 1573), yet in Alternative O the annual predicted woods sale quantity is estimated to be 38 MMBF (line 1908). A methodology of how the wood sale quantity is being estimated for each alternative should be clearly stated. This will give the public a better understanding of the decision making process so that they can be better involved in the process.

*Alternative P's road proposal is desirable because it would reduce suitability for roads from 83 percent (no-action) to 75 percent of the forest (line 1684-85). All of the alternatives reduce to road suitability by about 10% compared to the no-action plan, however Alternative P is focused on providing "a sustained flow of economic contributions to the local communities" (line 1656). This alternative claims to take wildlife habitat and hydrologic function into account when building roads, while allowing for access to resources and ability to address fuel levels. It is important that the forest continues to support the local community, while also taking the health of the environment and wildlife into consideration.

*Alternative P also carries important components for preserving the watersheds that modify the proposed plan. The proposed plan for riparian and aquatic areas is based on the Region 6 and Aquatic Riparian Conservation Strategy stated in line 1616. While it proposes an expansion of the designated watershed areas, the watershed network has since then (when the proposal was made in 2008), expanded. The modified ARCS plan would include five more watersheds to the watershed network. Along with an expanded and more inclusive watershed network, the modified ARCS would also have more clear objectives to riparian management (line 1715) and plans to prevent aquatic invasive species.

*The forest is currently home to endangered species such as the bulltrout and caribou, as well as to threatened species such as the Canada lynx, the grizzly bear, westslope cutthroat trout, kokanee salmon, and redband trout. Many of these species are culturally important to native American tribes. Therefore, we believe one of the plan's top priorities should be the expansion of wilderness areas as means of sanctuaries for the aforementioned species. We suggest using the section of Alternative B (pg. 56, Table 10) which proposes 20 percent, or 220,330 acres, of the forest be devoted to wilderness areas. We also favor Alternative B because it does not propose the

Kettle Crest area development. Instead, Alternative B opts to reduce back country motorized trails by 39 miles. This is optimal due to the fact that the motorized areas will not only taint their surrounding ecosystems through noise pollution and air pollution, but would also harm the forest terrain, vegetation, and aquatic life. Overall, these changes are necessary in promoting wildlife diversity because they not only provide safe havens for various forest dwellers, but they also prevent habitat fragmentation while maintaining the forest's integrity.