

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/27/2016 2:30:32 PM

First name: Jim

Last name: Hudkins

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Conversation opened. 4 messages. 1 message unread.

[Skip to content](#)

[Using Gmail with screen readers](#)

Try a fast, secure browser with updates built in [Yes, get Chrome now](#) [No, not interested](#)

×

Search

Gmail

COMPOSE

Labels

Inbox (2)

Starred

Important

Sent Mail

Drafts

Spam (3)

Trash

Junk

NEBCH

BCHW

Personal

Travel

Work

More labels

More

2 of 20

Expand all

Print all

In new window

Colville NF Plan position from NE Chapter

Inbox

x

Darrell Wallace

Attachments Jun 24 (3 days ago)

to Bernie, Jeff, Kathy, Dave, me, Lea, Bob

My apologies for the delay in sending this on. Bruce Foreman and Stuart Nieman from NE Chapter attended a listening session and Bruce wrote up the attached paper. NE Chapter supports his recommendations.

I particularly appreciate his comment about favoring Minimum Resource Analysis, which is consistent with the resolution passed by BCHW in March. My personal concern is that while current CNF officials say that they will not administer the proposed Wilderness as "designated" Wilderness, will that keep future CNF managers from changing that policy, even if Congress takes no action?

Attachments area

Jim Hudkins Attachments 2:01 PM (17 hours ago)

I hope you find this useful when talking with others interested in NE Chapter...

Nancy Harshman 3:21 PM (16 hours ago)

Thanks Jim, this will help and I will pass it on to other rider's. Nancy From...



Jeff Chapman <bbbranch@olympus.net>

11:04 PM (8 hours ago)

to Darrell, Bernie, Kathy, Dave, me, Lea, Bob

Thanks Darrell. This is very helpful. I agree with your concern.

Jeff

From: Darrell Wallace [mailto:dlwallace700@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 10:42 PM

To: Bernie Stratton; Jeff Chapman; Kathy Young; Dave Sunde; Jim Hudkins; Lea Myers Williams; Bob Gish

Subject: Colville NF Plan position from NE Chapter

My apologies for the delay in sending this on. Bruce Foreman and Stuart Nieman from NE Chapter attended a listening session and Bruce wrote up the attached paper. NE Chapter supports his recommendations.

[Click here to Reply, Reply to all, or Forward](#)

0.08 GB (0%) of 15 GB used

[Manage](#)

[Terms - Privacy](#)

Last account activity: 6 minutes ago

[Details](#)

6 more

Jeff Chapman's profile photo  
Jeff Chapman

Add to circles

Show details

Alternative Plan P

Page 1 of 3

Colville Forest Plan Revision - special non-motorized recreation mtg - attended by Stu Nieman, and Bruce Foreman

A Colville Forest Plan Revision Community of Interest Meeting for non-motorized recreation was held in Colville, 3-22- 2016, at the Community College facility just East of the Colville NF Admin building, see attachments for the meeting agenda and list of people that RSVP'd/attended, as well as a summary of the meeting, published by the meeting Facilitator, Susan Hyman of Enviroissues.com out of Boise, ID, funded by the Udall Foundation 1 (ie-US taxpayer funded-see below).

My take-away notes from the meeting:

The Alternative Plan P (preferred by the F.S.) is probably the best plan from a NEBCHW non-motorized user standpoint. Comments are desperately needed from us, by July 5, 2016, favoring this preferred plan, see below.

What has changed in the preferred Alternative P from the old plan?

1. The forest is re-categorized into 7 different types of MA's (Management areas), from the old 9 different types of MA's (for all alternatives except "no action Plan").
2. Recommended Wilderness - the 6 Revision plan alternatives differ in size from 1% to 20% increase in forest land currently recommended, with the FS preferred Alternative P being a 6% increase.

3. New Kettle Crest Special Interest Area of 83,800 acres - retains semi-primitive setting while allowing motorized and mechanized recreation opportunities
4. Reduces percentage of forest suitable for roads from 83% to 75%
5. Increases percentage of BACKCOUNTRY forest suitable for motorized use from 1% to 6%
6. The amount (percent) of the Colville National Forest identified to be managed specifically for non-motorized use increases from 11% to 20%.
7. Integrates caribou recovery into the Focused Restoration MA's (true for all 6 alternatives).
8. Reduces by 78 miles, the trails for mechanized use (mtn bikes)
9. Increases by 50% the annual timber harvest from current 41MBF to 62MBF, but still less than the original 1988 plan of 123MBF due to amendments such as INFISH (inland native fish Strategy), and the East Side Screen (East of Cascades protection of trees 21" diam. or larger).

What has not changed from the old plan?

1. - rules, ie-mechanized use, chainsaws etc., stay the same, while some of the other alternative plans would require managing Recommended Wilderness MA's as if they were actual wilderness (ie-no mechanized uses such as chainsaws, mtn bikes).
2. Backcountry motorized use would retain all existing backcountry motorized trails across the forest.

Page 2 of 3

3. Research Natural Area (RNA's), are not travel restricted, just set-asides for some specific types of trees, flora, fauna, etc., no impact on non-motorized travel recreation.
4. The old "Wood/forage" MA is discontinued, but firewood cutting and grazing of livestock will stay the same as a percentage of the total forest. Firewood cutting in some of the other alternatives would be reduced. Grazing, however, would stay the same in all the alternatives.

We BCHW folks brought up the issue of continuing long-term trend of steadily increasing backlog of trails not cleared of windfall, and the fact that volunteer horsemen with chainsaws are 5-10 times more efficient than with crosscut saws. We need to send in our comments and include this issue, not mentioning chainsaws per se, but rather emphasize that we expect to see more "minimum requirements Analysis" done on trail maintenance projects, along with cost/benefit analyses, and a plan for reducing the backlog of "unmaintained/unlogged out" trail miles, utilizing an ever increasing pool of trained/certified volunteers.

Other stuff:

July 5, 2016 - comment period ends; positive comments are needed, maybe more so than negative or otherwise critical comments, to help assure acceptance of our favorite option. Note: Form letters that are rcv'd only count as ONE, so write your own personal letter or comments. Posting comments online are best done by using the Colville "Open House" website 2 which has good instructions on commenting, or go directly to the USDA website 3 which includes the ability to post comments via the interactive map, as well as each optional alternative plan. Comments, whether posted online, email, even snail mail letters will be posted on the website as well (will be scanned, then posted) for our review. It would be wise to watch the postings online to see which way things are swaying, and giving us the opportunity to scale up a letter writing campaign if necessary -squeakiest wheels get the most attention.

The Colville Forest Revision Plan 4 link is seen below.

Attachments:

.pdf's from 3-21- 16 email, agenda, list of RSVP's

pdf's from 5-5- 2016 email, summarizing our mtg, including list of attendees, and the slide show.

23 total attendees (of the 25 that RSVP'd):

6 BCHW

3 BC hunters & Anglers,

6 USFS,

2 Evergreen Mtn bike,

3 NE WA Trailblazers,

2 PNTA,

1 WTA)

Page 3 of 3

1 Udall Foundation:

The Udall Foundation was established by the U.S. Congress in 1992 as an independent executive branch agency to honor Morris K. Udall's lasting impact on this nation's environment, public lands, and natural resources, and his support of the rights and self-governance of American Indians and Alaska Natives. The 1998 Environmental Policy and Conflict Resolution Act created the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution as a program of the Udall Foundation to assist parties in resolving environmental, public lands, and natural resources conflicts nationwide that involve federal agencies or interests. In 2009, Congress enacted legislation to honor Stewart L. Udall and add his name to the Udall Foundation

.

2 Colville NF Plan Revision "Open House" website: <http://colvilleplanrevision.publicmeeting.info/>

3 USDA Colville National Forest-Forest Plan Revision project website:

<http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/colville/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprd3824594>

4 Go to the main Colville website <http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/colville/home> , then click on "Forest Plan Revision" under heading "Quick Links", then click on "Visit Online Open House", and/or click on

"Submit Formal Comment". (Note the schedule for more upcoming meetings, online).

.

1 of 3

Colville Forest Plan Revision-NEC position.docx

Open with

I would like to go on record as in favor of the Forest Service Plan Revision "Alternative Plan P". Thank You Jim



Hudkins

Conversation opened. 4 messages. 1 message unread.

[Skip to content](#)  
[Using Gmail with screen readers](#)

Try a fast, secure browser with updates built in [Yes, get Chrome now](#) [No, not interested](#)

×

Search

Gmail

COMPOSE

Labels

Inbox (2)

Starred

Important

Sent Mail

Drafts

Spam (3)

Trash

Junk

NEBCH

BCHW

Personal

Travel

Work

More labels

More

2 of 20

Expand all

Print all

In new window

Colville NF Plan position from NE Chapter

Inbox

x

Darrell Wallace

Attachments Jun 24 (3 days ago)

to Bernie, Jeff, Kathy, Dave, me, Lea, Bob

My apologies for the delay in sending this on. Bruce Foreman and Stuart Nieman from NE Chapter attended a listening session and Bruce wrote up the attached paper. NE Chapter supports his recommendations.

I particularly appreciate his comment about favoring Minimum Resource Analysis, which is consistent with the resolution passed by BCHW in March. My personal concern is that while current CNF officials say that they will not administer the proposed Wilderness as "designated" Wilderness, will that keep future CNF managers from changing that policy, even if Congress takes no action?

Attachments area

Jim Hudkins Attachments 2:01 PM (17 hours ago)

I hope you find this useful when talking with others interested in NE Chapter...

Nancy Harshman 3:21 PM (16 hours ago)

Thanks Jim, this will help and I will pass it on to other rider's. Nancy From...



Jeff Chapman <bbbranch@olympus.net>

11:04 PM (8 hours ago)

to Darrell, Bernie, Kathy, Dave, me, Lea, Bob

Thanks Darrell. This is very helpful. I agree with your concern.

Jeff

From: Darrell Wallace [mailto:dlwallace700@gmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 10:42 PM  
To: Bernie Stratton; Jeff Chapman; Kathy Young; Dave Sunde; Jim Hudkins; Lea Myers Williams; Bob Gish  
Subject: Colville NF Plan position from NE Chapter

My apologies for the delay in sending this on. Bruce Foreman and Stuart Nieman from NE Chapter attended a listening session and Bruce wrote up the attached paper. NE Chapter supports his recommendations.

[Click here to Reply, Reply to all, or Forward](#)

0.08 GB (0%) of 15 GB used

[Manage](#)

[Terms - Privacy](#)

Last account activity: 6 minutes ago

[Details](#)

6 more

Jeff Chapman's profile photo  
Jeff Chapman

Add to circles

Show details

Alternative Plan P

Page 1 of 3

Colville Forest Plan Revision - special non-motorized recreation mtg - attended by Stu Nieman, and Bruce Foreman

A Colville Forest Plan Revision Community of Interest Meeting for non-motorized recreation was held in Colville, 3-22- 2016, at the Community College facility just East of the Colville NF Admin building, see attachments for the meeting agenda and list of people that RSVP'd/attended, as well as a summary of the meeting, published by the meeting Facilitator, Susan Hyman of Enviroissues.com out of Boise, ID, funded by the Udall Foundation 1 (ie-US taxpayer funded-see below).

My take-away notes from the meeting:

The Alternative Plan P (preferred by the F.S.) is probably the best plan from a NEBCHW non-motorized user standpoint. Comments are desperately needed from us, by July 5, 2016, favoring this preferred plan, see below.

What has changed in the preferred Alternative P from the old plan?

1. The forest is re-categorized into 7 different types of MA's (Management areas), from the old 9 different types of MA's (for all alternatives except "no action Plan").
2. Recommended Wilderness - the 6 Revision plan alternatives differ in size from 1% to 20% increase in forest land currently recommended, with the FS preferred Alternative P being a 6% increase.

3. New Kettle Crest Special Interest Area of 83,800 acres - retains semi-primitive setting while allowing motorized and mechanized recreation opportunities
4. Reduces percentage of forest suitable for roads from 83% to 75%
5. Increases percentage of BACKCOUNTRY forest suitable for motorized use from 1% to 6%
6. The amount (percent) of the Colville National Forest identified to be managed specifically for non-motorized use increases from 11% to 20%.
7. Integrates caribou recovery into the Focused Restoration MA's (true for all 6 alternatives).
8. Reduces by 78 miles, the trails for mechanized use (mtn bikes)
9. Increases by 50% the annual timber harvest from current 41MBF to 62MBF, but still less than the original 1988 plan of 123MBF due to amendments such as INFISH (inland native fish Strategy), and the East Side Screen (East of Cascades protection of trees 21" diam. or larger).

What has not changed from the old plan?

1. - rules, ie-mechanized use, chainsaws etc., stay the same, while some of the other alternative plans would require managing Recommended Wilderness MA's as if they were actual wilderness (ie-no mechanized uses such as chainsaws, mtn bikes).
2. Backcountry motorized use would retain all existing backcountry motorized trails across the forest.

Page 2 of 3

3. Research Natural Area (RNA's), are not travel restricted, just set-asides for some specific types of trees, flora, fauna, etc., no impact on non-motorized travel recreation.
4. The old "Wood/forage" MA is discontinued, but firewood cutting and grazing of livestock will stay the same as a percentage of the total forest. Firewood cutting in some of the other alternatives would be reduced. Grazing, however, would stay the same in all the alternatives.

We BCHW folks brought up the issue of continuing long-term trend of steadily increasing backlog of trails not cleared of windfall, and the fact that volunteer horsemen with chainsaws are 5-10 times more efficient than with crosscut saws. We need to send in our comments and include this issue, not mentioning chainsaws per se, but rather emphasize that we expect to see more "minimum requirements Analysis" done on trail maintenance projects, along with cost/benefit analyses, and a plan for reducing the backlog of "unmaintained/unlogged out" trail miles, utilizing an ever increasing pool of trained/certified volunteers.

Other stuff:

July 5, 2016 - comment period ends; positive comments are needed, maybe more so than negative or otherwise critical comments, to help assure acceptance of our favorite option. Note: Form letters that are rcv'd only count as ONE, so write your own personal letter or comments. Posting comments online are best done by using the Colville "Open House" website 2 which has good instructions on commenting, or go directly to the USDA website 3 which includes the ability to post comments via the interactive map, as well as each optional alternative plan. Comments, whether posted online, email, even snail mail letters will be posted on the website as well (will be scanned, then posted) for our review. It would be wise to watch the postings online to see which way things are swaying, and giving us the opportunity to scale up a letter writing campaign if necessary -squeakiest wheels get the most attention.

The Colville Forest Revision Plan 4 link is seen below.

Attachments:

.pdf's from 3-21- 16 email, agenda, list of RSVP's

pdf's from 5-5- 2016 email, summarizing our mtg, including list of attendees, and the slide show.

23 total attendees (of the 25 that RSVP'd):

6 BCHW

3 BC hunters & Anglers,

6 USFS,

2 Evergreen Mtn bike,

3 NE WA Trailblazers,

2 PNTA,

1 WTA)

Page 3 of 3

1 Udall Foundation:

The Udall Foundation was established by the U.S. Congress in 1992 as an independent executive branch agency to honor Morris K. Udall's lasting impact on this nation's environment, public lands, and natural resources, and his support of the rights and self-governance of American Indians and Alaska Natives. The 1998 Environmental Policy and Conflict Resolution Act created the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution as a program of the Udall Foundation to assist parties in resolving environmental, public lands, and natural resources conflicts nationwide that involve federal agencies or interests. In 2009, Congress enacted legislation to honor Stewart L. Udall and add his name to the Udall Foundation

.

2 Colville NF Plan Revision "Open House" website: <http://colvilleplanrevision.publicmeeting.info/>

3 USDA Colville National Forest-Forest Plan Revision project website:

<http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/colville/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprd3824594>

4 Go to the main Colville website <http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/colville/home> , then click on "Forest Plan Revision" under heading "Quick Links", then click on "Visit Online Open House", and/or click on "Submit Formal Comment". (Note the schedule for more upcoming meetings, online).

1 of 3

Colville Forest Plan Revision-NEC position.docx

Open with



