

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

First name: Gary

Last name: Prewitt

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Forest Revision Plan Comments 16-07-05

Amy Dillon, Forest Plan Revision Team
Colville National Forest, Colville Supervisor's Office
765 South Main. Colville, Washington 99114
5 July 2016

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Forest Plan Revision for the Colville National Forest. Generally I support the preferred alternative. Alternative P with the following comments.

Wilderness:

In 2008-10 all 21 PWA's in the Colville N.F. were evaluated by a varied group of forest service employees and the public. For one reason or another none of the 21 PWA's contained in the CNF met the requirements for designation under the Wilderness Act of 1964. These PWA's are in fact defacto wilderness given the CNF propensity to not actively manage these areas.

None of these areas can stand the test of wilderness designation on their own. It appears they are included to satisfy certain advocacy groups who hope and push for omnibus wilderness legislation from the U.S. Congress. They should be eliminated from the FRP altogether.

Kettle Crest Recreation Special Interest Area:

Support the concept of a special interest area. However the SIA should be divided to accommodate possible development of a multi-use recreation trail along the Old Stage Route Trail as this is of significant historical interest to all state residents.

Recreation and Travel Management:

Many places within the FPR refer to road density, MVUM, road decommissioning, etc. While the CNF may wish to treat the Travel Management Plan as a stand alone entity, it is not. The management classifications of the RFP govern the direction of what may or may not happen to enhance or degrade motorized recreation. The plan provision to designate 45 additional miles of mixed use roads is unacceptable. USFS Region 1 and the CNF have seen fit to set aside state law concerning ATV and Wheeled All Terrain Vehicle use on most maintenance level 2-5 roads. All other forms of transportation, licensed or unlicensed, are allowed on these roads except ATV's and Wheeled All Terrain Vehicles. WHY?

Remembering that the FRP is a "PLAN". Then when decommissioning or closing an existing road it should be considered and evaluated to become a trail if feasible. This is far more cost effective than obliterating.

The FRP states the lack of adequate ATV trails. Yet there is no proposal or plan to remedy that situation in the management direction. The FRP should include a proposal for updating.

The FRP and the Recreation Report rightfully state that our population is growing and getting older placing more and more demands for recreation on the CNF. The older generation due to longer lifespans require more mechanical and motorized means to enjoy our recreation resources.

Camping facilities are woefully outdated within the CNF. Yet nothing in the RFP shows any kind of plan or proposed schedule for updating for what would be the next 10-15 years. The FRP should include a proposal for updating.

Gary Prewitt
10702 E. Boundary Rd.

Elk, WA 99009