

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/20/2018 8:28:09 AM

First name: Kenn

Last name: Roberts

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

8 March 2018

Josh Milligan, Plan Revision Lead

1206 South Challis Street

Salmon, Idaho 83467

Dear Mr Milligan:

To begin any meaningful discussions, individuals must start on the same page, i.e., to understand the ground rules, to work with relevant data from which conclusions can be drawn and agreements on the process by which the discussions are directed. Anything less will result in a mediocre and suspect documentation at best....a meaningless process and a waste of time for all.

This is specifically relevant for the Forest Plan Revision process now underway. Because there now exists such areas of disagreement and/or confusion with this revision discussion, I propose the following items to be considered prior to commencing forward to any final draft/revision product:

?There appears to be a difference of opinion on who is the 'ruling authority' in this process. By rule, local citizens and local controlling governmental bodies SHALL outweigh any and all NON local opinions and NGOs. Please consult the Citizen's Guide to National Forest Planning, the 2012 Planning Rule, NEPA and federal laws NFMAE and FLPMA. These documents describe the role individuals play in effecting/determining the planning process in their immediate vicinity, by giving the local residences voices with greater authority in the planning and plan implementation process.

?A consensus/understanding must be reached on the use of Climate Change as a planning issue. There remain numerous discrepancies and misinformation between non-locally generated data and locally generated. There is also the question if this data is pertinent to be considered in this revision process in the first place. So to facilitate the Forest Plan Revision process, parties must agree to dispense with any use of Climate Change data in this revision as we must work with hard science and demonstrable results. Please see previous letters address to Mr Josh Milligan, et al: Mr Darr Moon (21 February 2018) and Mrs Molly Newcomb (25 February 2018).

?Parties must come to an agreement on what constitutes a Wild and Scenic River (WSR) inventory PRIOR to their inclusion in this revision process. Consensus must be obtained on what determines eligibility, the correct methodology in determining same (and it should mandate ON SITE VISITS) and the importance the inhabitants (and their livelihood) play in these determinations.

Bottom line, we should have common ground from which to base our conclusions and to assist in this Forest Plan Revision process before we address any and all individual talking points. These and other agreed upon ground rules will provide a more concise direction in establishing an acceptable Forest Plan Revision with clearly stated parameters and well reasoned objectives and data.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kenn Roberts
25 W Foothill Road
Salmon, ID 83467