

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/26/2016 10:40:36 PM
First name: louis
Last name: exner
Organization:
Title:
Comments: [Caution: Spam] Forest Plan Comment

To: Amy Dillion, Forest Plan Revision Team
Colville National Forest
Colville, Wa 99114

From: Johnna Exner
450 White Mountain Road
Curlew, Wa 99118

To whom it may concern;

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Revised Land Management Plan. I realize a tremendous amount of time and effort has gone into this document and appreciate your concern to help us consider the best uses for our public lands. My name is Johnna Exner, I am a citizen of Ferry County and the United States. I serve as member of the Planning Commission, the Natural Resource Board, the Board of Equalization and the Eagle Cliff Grange.

Page 786 lines 26454 to 26455 state

"The county land use plan describes local government goals and objectives for land management and provides opportunities for COORDINATION between the Forest Service and the County." Yet any recommendations for wilderness are in direct contradiction to multi use of the forest (public land) reducing it to special interests and is detrimental to restoring, let alone maintaining a healthy forest. Also, any recommended wilderness would contradict our counties designation of long term significance in Timber, Mineral and Agricultural (grazing).

Pg 502 table 175 shows

All alternatives authorize only 27,580 AUM for cattle and 0 for sheep. Yet

Pg 526 table 179 shows the forest capable of grazing

690,311 cattle

881,287 sheep

This is emphasized on

Pg 519 lines 18053 to 18054 in the sentence

"The total contribution of national forest land grazing is understated."

The entire paragraph (lines 18052 to 18060) supports

Pg 786 line 26455 "coordination between the Forest Service and the County."

Pg 519 lines 18045 to 18051 refers to the

"relatively large numbers of sheep and cattle that grazed the Forest during the 1920s, 1930's and 1940's with cattle utilizing the lower elevations and sheep grazing the higher elevations..."

It would be interesting to see how many major fires occurred during that time, compared to the depleted numbers of AUMs grazing today with the ever increasing devastation by fire.

Pg 522 lines 18164 to 18166 again supports the importance of grazing

..."grazing...contributes to the stability and social, economic, and cultural aspects of rural communities.

Pg 569 lines 19903 to 19904 states

"Any potential wilderness area recommended to Congress is managed to preserve those wilderness characteristics that made it a candidate for wilderness until Congress chooses to take action."

Any recommendations for wilderness are in direct contradiction to multi use of the Forest as well as the Counties designation of lands of long term significance in Timber, Mineral and Agricultural.

Pg 70 of volume 1 lines 2240 to 2243 state the

Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960

lines 2247 to 2250 state the

National Forest Management Act of 1976

Both of these Acts support the multiple use concept that established our forest for public use.

Pg 16 lines 392 to 393 of the draft intro state

"Direction for land management plans is to focus on outcomes achieved over time (desired conditions) instead of outputs (products, goods and services) as on previous plans. Without timber harvest (to the level of 120 mbf as it was in the 1980's) grazing, firewood, etc a healthy forest cannot exist. The lack of timber harvest alone in the last 20+ years, along with escalating insect infestation and destruction by fires the last few years proves what outcomes (negative impact) lack of management has produced.

My family has a vested interest in the forest as our property is bordered by it on 3 sides. For the last 40 years we have seen a relatively healthy forest decline into an insect infested tinder box. Our trees are now infected with insects because of it.

My comment would be to continue with the No Action plan with an addendum of removing the 21 dbh limit on timber harvest. All other alternatives recommend wilderness and a disproportionate use for recreation with a disparity between motorized and non-motorized. Wilderness cannot take precedence over multi use or grazing or "the plan does not strike the correct balance between ecological protection and local economic need." Pg 786 line 26452.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the plan.

Johnna Exner

450 White Mountain Road

Curlew, Wa. 99118

509-779-4375