May 6, 2020

USDA Forest Service, Region 2, Rocky Mountain Region Attn: Objection Reviewing Officer: <u>https://cara.ecosystem-management.org/Public/CommentInput?Project=51255</u> P.O. Box 189 Golden, Co 80402

Re: Objections to the new Draft Record of Decision (ROD) and modified Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Medicine Bow Landscape Vegetation Analysis Project.

Dear Reviewing Officer:

The moderately revised new draft ROD and modified final EIS, while somewhat of an improvement from the former discarded large and ill-defined initial attempt, never-the-less again failed to adequately address a number issues that my initial and secondary comments targeted. Among the most salient of these objections and reiterated suggestions are the following:

1) The new ROD again arbitrarily selected Alternative 2 as the preferred selection rather than trying to develop and identify a possible **3**rd **Alternative** that could have addressed the many issues raised and it should be developed for review. In essence this was again a **"take it or leave it"** situation ... a poor choice that continues to ignore a variety of issues previously raised during both the original and secondary review process and yet this rational suggestion was not considered.

2) The proposal to log and employ various treatments (thinning, prescribed burns, selective mature harvest, clearcutting, etc.) over extensive areas of the identified approximately 360,000 acres will likely have a profound impact on: a) the *habitat* of virtually every creature and the many organisms that live within the anticipated project boundaries, many of which will have both short and long-term deleterious effects on the habitat; b) *water* (reduced snow-pack, related run-off, reduced forage, sedimentation erosion, topsoil loss and regenerative impairment, flooding, fish mortality); c) *cover* (thermal, visual, auditory and or flight escape habitat loss causing physical and behavioral wildlife stress).

3) The revised road building that eliminates the 10 miles of permanent **roads** is somewhat of an improvement from the DEIS but it does not fully address: a) the impact that about 600 miles of temporary **road construction**, maintenance and decommissioning will have on wildlife and the local plant communities, b) the precise physical location of each road and its impact on that very specific area, c) the manner in which both the legal and illegal ATV use of these roads during their construction through and after abandonment will then be employed to control their use, i.e., use gates erected to limit or preclude unauthorized use, adequate signage, increased Forest Service Ranger numbers and presence, etc., d) a cost analysis of the added expense to improve and then maintain a large number of both already extant FS roads and also to build and reclaim all the old temporary roads.

(4) In light of the fact that *site parameters* have not been determined for all the 300,000 plus acres it is essential that each sale location evaluate the following: a) elevation, b) site solar orientation, c) average slope, d) annual precipitation, e) site wind direction prevalence, f) the vegetative composition and ground cover percentage, g) ratios of shrub and tree species, h) plant densities, and i) stand age and condition in order that a proper evaluation of its suitability is made.

5) A variety of *logging and treatment options* can have dramatically different impacts on site locations and the fact that the specific management options are not precisely laid out raises questions as to the actual impacts that are being considered for mitigation: a) noise and optical game disturbance can result in avoidance behavior, b) interrupting seasonal migration corridors, c) degradation of range forage and water resources and d) illegal human activity.

6) Given that *climate change* is a scientifically acknowledged fact, it would seem logical that the EIS would have a substantial number of references and action considerations for its clear influence but that does not seem to be the case, particularly since climate change does impact: a) warmer temperature variations that favor destructive insect populations, i.e., pine beetles, aspen borers, etc., and many invasive plant species, b) the severity and frequency of weather systems that have a direct impact on the types and quantity of measureable precipitation, c) extreme drought and flood conditions, d) severe fire risk, e) lagging regrowth of replanted logging sites and f) disruption of ecosystem wildlife and plant distributions that undermine long term goals.

7) While prescribed burns are mentioned in the EIS as well as other strategies to include "clear cutting" etc., other significant types of *fire management* received little mention but should include: a) a **"let it burn"** strategy in wilderness areas and roadless areas where no structures or human life would be threatened, b) more reliable tactics not relying on road access, i.e., aircraft water drops, etc., c) a strategy to plant more drought resistant plants and trees in all appropriate post-treatment areas, and d) leaving large areas of clear cut treated space where no replanting would be conducted as a low fuel "natural fire break" in strategic areas throughout the project.

8) Some "boiler plate" *reclamation* strategies are suggested in the FEIS but they did not necessarily include: a) recognition that not all locations should be returned to their original native condition and that **many sites should be left "as is"** or given a different reclaimed status, b) a few sites could be improved by contemplating wildlife friendly plants in replanting, c) appropriate sites could be improved by adding more water sources, d) sites that show **invasive species** presence on or near the site should be aggressively treated, and e) **physical barriers of various types, i.e.**, gates, berms, boulders, etc., **across decommissioned roads** installed to minimize unauthorized travel.

9) The concept of *multiple use* has and will likely be challenged by a project of this extreme magnitude in that: a) large areas of the forest will be unavailable during the various operations of the LaVA project that will restrict public use of the forest for several decades, b) considerable new changes will occur both in terms of access to their familiar locations as well as the distribution of the users across the forest, and c) use of the forest may be forever altered due to the extreme project length (15 years) and size (360,000 acres) of the active logging, treatment and road building areas that will affect nearly half of the acreage in the project's proposed size (850,000 acres).

10) The participation of other *governmental agencies* in the formulation of various aspects of the EIS was evident but the elements of the various contributions were not given sufficient weight in certain areas of management concern. A simple remedy to such omissions would be to: a) adopt one or more of the Wyoming Game and Fish Department wildlife management plans, e.g., the Mule Deer Initiatives, as a guide to forest management planning with respect to wildlife, b) meet regularly with agencies to adapt practices and policy to changes seen on the ground in this project's coverage area, and c) hold meetings on 3 or 5 year intervals to evaluate the project status.

11) While the *Sheep Mountain Game Refuge* (SMGR) was mentioned and a few changes to the management prescriptions were added as was the addition of some clear new restrictions on former commercial activities thereon, a critical and glaring oversight occurred regarding the

status of a certain portion of the original SMGR. That oversight entails a failure to recognize the boundary of the refuge as defined by the 1924 Presidential Proclamation that created the new SMGR and established its boundaries (see Proclamation and SMGR map attached). At some point in the last century, the U.S. Forest Service arbitrarily decided to change the SMGR management prescriptions for a portion of the SMGR refuge located west and south of the original boundary. This large parcel of roughly 3,000 acres has since been managed as if it had never been a part of the original SMGR despite FS mapping as late as 2018 that showed the original SMGR boundary lines as intact (see ALP Land Status and Encumbrance Map attached). A recent FOIA request as submitted by the Sierra Club to the FS produced no record of a change in its management status. (see Exhibit 5 – 3,000 acre exclusion). However, in recent years, the FS in concert with WGFD, did agree to jointly create a "de facto" return to the original SMGR boundary by imposing a road closure order to protect wintering wildlife (see Decision Memo, April 28, 2016). Hence, the USFS should immediately endeavor to restore the SMGR to its original boundaries as no justification can be shown for the changes. A failure to correct this situation could allow additional roads and trails to be built, significant range conditions to deteriorate, wildlife corridors and seasonal game occupation to be permanently altered, inappropriate management prescriptions implimented that would violate the semi-roadless and otherwise pristine quality of said acreage and hence necessitating possible litigation to enjoin the FS from implementing the invalid EIS management prescription on the improperly redesignated 3,000 acres.

Regrettably, the "new revised LaVA plan" did little to resolve the subjects raised in this and many other submissions and ignored many issues raised heretofore. Issues that had been raised were not fully explored, i.e., poor recovery of logged areas where some sites had no regneration after some wild fires, huge increases in (800 %) ccf annual rates, failure to describe measures to protect the closed temporary roads, numerous unjustified NEPA rule exclusions, etc. Worse yet, some subjects were ignored totally again, i.e., the 3,000 acre parcel south and west of Fox Creek.

Thank you for this opportunity to improve and or enhance the final EIS and please give these objections and constructive suggestions their due consideration. I remain,

Respectfully yours,

Signed: RWD- Tout Date: 5 6

Exhibits: Attachment A - 1924 Coolidge Seventh Proclamation: SMGR Map – Sheep Mountain Game Refuge, Circa 1924 Forest Service - ALP Land Status and Encumbrance Map, 3-7-2018 Decision Memo for Changes to Eastern Snowy Range Seasonal Big Game Road Closures Exhibit 5 – 3,000 acre exclusion

SMGR Documents, Maps and Other Exhibits





Sheep Mountain Game Refuge – Circa 1924

ALP Land Status and Encumbrance

Page 1 of 1





3/7/2018

Decision Memo Signed for Changes to Eastern Snowy Range Seasonal Big Game Road Closures



News Release

Medicine Bow-Routt National Forests & Thunder Basin National Grassland http://fs.usda.gov/mbr

(LARAMIE, Wyo.) April 28, 2016 - Laramie District Ranger

Frank Romero signed a U.S. Forest Service (USFS) decision memo earlier this week to improve crucial big game habitat along the southeast boundary of the Snowy Range. The decision will extend existing seasonal road closures on the Medicine Bow National Forest, as well as allow installation of new gates to assist with compliance, and place new sections of area roads under seasonal closures. The project was developed in collaboration with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department, and specifically for the Sheep Mountain Mule Deer Initiative.

Following is information on the project, which will be implemented this fall:

- Existing seasonal closures will be extended from the current dates of Nov. 15 April 31 to a longer timeframe of Oct. 1 - June 15each year. This applies to 37 miles of roads on a narrow section of Forest that runs south from near Lake Owen along the foothills to the Wyoming/Colorado state line.
- Five new gates will be installed at locations which access the seasonally closed roads. These
 gates are meant to better enforce the closures.
- Additional sections of roads that do not currently have seasonal closures will have seasonal closures applied so that gates can be installed at practical traffic pinch points. Approximately 8.6 total miles of roads will have this new seasonal closure, spread over 10 different sections of road directly adjacent to crucial big game habitat.

"I appreciate all of the people who took time to speak with me in person or send in their comments about this project," said Laramie District Ranger Frank Romero. "I did a lot of reading and listening, and feel that I heard those both for and against our proposal. "Ultimately, what led me to this decision is the science that points to how important the habitat is and how herds will benefit from the seasonal closures."By working closely with the Wyoming Game & Fish Department, I think this decision presents a win-win situation. Big game herds win because they get the habitat and protection they need to prosper, and hunters win because the game they seek is more likely to stay on public land and be more available during hunting season. "I want to stress that we are not closing the area to the public. The public may still use the area and even drive relatively close to the Forest boundary in most places. Specific to hunting, this decision just changes the location where the walking portion of the hunt starts," concluded Romero.

"Wyoming Game and Fish Department supports this decision and feels it addresses several of the issues that were brought up during the collaborative Sheep Mountain Mule Deer Initiative meetings," said Corey Class, WGFD Laramie Wildlife Coordinator. "This is an example of how WGFD and the USFS can work together to improve the quality of wildlife habitat and hunting." The area on Forest affected by these closures is critically important to local deer and elk herds as it contains transition habitat, winter range, and fawning and calving areas.

Per direction from the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, the USFS manages these specific areas to provide adequate amounts of quality forage, cover, and solitude for deer, elk, and other species. The areas should provide sufficient habitat and protection from disturbance to support the population and management objectives for transitioning and wintering deer, elk and other species. The Forest Service develops these objectives in consultation with the WGFD.

A comment period was held from late February through late March in order to solicit public input on the project. Project information, including a map that shows locations of roads with seasonal road closures and gate locations is available on the Medicine Bow National Forest web http://www.fs.fed.us/nepa/nepa_project_exp.php?project=47351feromero@fs.fed.ushttp://fs.usda.gov/mbr



https://greenwoodmap.com/albany/map

5/6/2020