

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/7/2016 12:00:00 AM

First name: Shelly

Last name: Short

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I live in Addy, Washington, but my office is here in Republic. I'm Shelly Short, State Representative to this District. I'm no stranger to forest planning or reading EISs having served for Congressman Nethercutt's Field Director for 10 years. But, really, the thing that has struck me in reading, especially through the Draft Resource Plan, is the lack of a Small Business Fairness Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act type of an analysis that says the small businesses in the area are going to be, you know, impacted either for good, or not for good depending on what's going on, and that that analysis needs to be undertaken. Now, I have heard -- oh, and then you need to mitigate, do the things that you must do on the National Forest, but you must mitigate that to make sure and lessen the impacts on the small businesses that utilize the National Forest.

On the recent webinar I attended, or just listened in on, I asked the question about that analysis, and a Forest Service person answered they did not feel the need to do that because they're not a regulatory entity, but as I read through the Draft Management Plan it's very clear to me that the standards and guides have to be followed if the projects are going to be approved. It lists projects -- proposed projects do not meet standards and guides, then they must either be rejected by the Forest Supervisor, amended to meet it, or come up with, you know, an amendment to the National Forest Plan -- or to the Colville National Forest Plan. So, I actually disagree. I think very much those standards and guides, in fact, are a way to regulate local projects that are proposed, and I think because of that an analysis -- that kind of analysis needs to be undertaken, and is absent from the document, as I've been reading it.

You know, you think of the reason that the national forests were put together, in 1906 the Enabling Act was for plentiful supplies of timbers for the local -- you know, for the local communities. Now, while a lot has changed, the base that I read is that those that are closest to the National Forest are impacted, again, either in a positive way, or in a negative way by the management of the land, there's 1.1 million acres. So I think it's very important that that analysis be undertaken. I will be providing written comments to that effect. Thank you very much.