

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/30/2016 7:00:00 AM

First name: Raymond

Last name: DePuydt

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Comment of Revised CNF Management Plan

Ray DePuydt

Rice, WA

My overall comment on the plan is that it is extremely difficult to assess the effects of the different alternatives. It sometimes seems as if the various plans are a mix and match of different components that makes it difficult to why some of the components are combined with others. If you select one of the alternatives because you like one if its components you might have to also live with another element of the alternative that is almost counter to the other. For example, I like the idea of a Dynamic Landscape approach but I think the amount of projected wood sale is too high and there is not enough acres designated as wilderness.

Protections of the riparian areas and other protected management areas are not sufficient because all of the restrictions that would protect the riparian areas have loopholes or special conditions that prevent the protection of the resources. A permittee can even dump mine waste in the riparian areas if they consider it essential to do so. How is such a wimpy guideline ever going to protect the riparian areas if all the permittee or project director have to do is say it is essential to their mission. It seems to me that the CNF considers the protection of riparian areas and other resources as a low priority-way below logging, grazing, mining and motorized access. Nowhere in the plan do I see terms like "will not", "prohibited", "restricted", "reserved" etc. All the terms talk of "goals", "desired conditions", "operationally feasible" and "minimizing"-all to be accomplished with water-downed guidelines and wishful thinking in some distant time in the future. If I got the impression that there was going to be some actual protections in the various management areas outside of the timber production areas then I would feel comfortable with your preferred alternative-even understanding that it calls for an increase in lumber production. I am not against logging or grazing but I think that there has to be some hard restrictions in order to achieve the forest health that is the goal of the plan. If there can't be any practical protection for sensitive areas then it seems to me that the only way to protect any of the forest is to designate more acreage as Wilderness. I think there is a middle way between Wilderness designation and other management designations but the devil is in the details and some firm decisions about restricting some activities in the other management areas must be made. I do not see this happening in the plan. I also think that much of the logging that occurs in the CNF should be conducted as part of a pre-commercial thinning and prescribed fire project and not just timber production. I do not see single entry clear-cutting with huge equipment to be the answer for forest health.

As for the Kettle Crest Special Interest Area, I do not think that there should be an increase in motorized trails in that area-especially putting a motorized trail in a roadless area. That makes no sense to me. With the size of the ORVs getting bigger and bigger, there soon will be little difference from a motorized trail and an unimproved road. Besides there are already so many roads and motorized trails throughout the forest, why is there a need to put one in a roadless area? There are not enough areas in the lower elevations of the CNF where there are non-motorized trails as it is and now that Boulder has been burned it would be great if there was a non-motorized ski trail in that area. Also I have been skiing on the upper part of the South Sherman road for 20 years and it would be great if four or five miles of the road would be designated non-motorized. This designation would not prevent motorized vehicles from accessing the road because they can come into the region from east end of the road but it would provide a mid-elevation ski area for people without the skill to go on the Kettle Crest. I know that this document is supposed to be programmatic in nature but the plan does talk about specific motorized trails and I think that creating more non-motorized trails is equally important.

In summary I am for more Wilderness designation, no expansion of motorized trails (especially in roadless areas, maintenance of current logging production levels and firmer protections of riparian habitats and sensitive management areas.