

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/25/2016 4:38:13 AM

First name: Jane

Last name: Timberlake

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The forest management plan outlined in Alternative O of the Proposed Revised Land Management Plan for Colville National Forest is desirable because it allocates a portion of the Forest for vegetation management, which includes restoration and timber production emphasis. 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.

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 as well.

In continuation, 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. However, Alternatives B and O are desirable because they limit the miles of road in a national forest. This aspect would be good incorporate with Alternative P because it would force forest managers to wisely choose where they build roads. Although, the effect that possible roads could have on the environment and wildlife should always be the primary 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. (Geneva)

Based off of the 90 day scoping and commenting period, it seems pertinent that the public's suggestion regarding wilderness expansion be granted as well. Therefore, we suggest using the section of Alternative B which proposes the largest wilderness increase of 220,330. These 20 additional wilderness areas would not allow for the development of the Kettle Crest area due to spacial restrictions. 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.