

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/5/2016 6:26:08 PM

First name: Scott

Last name: Reigel

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am commenting directly to the Colville NF multiple use plan but indirectly to the failed forest management concepts of the NF as a whole.

I am the son of a retired TMA for 40 years with the NF, I am a consulting forester, and I am a professor of Silviculture, Ecology, Mensuration, and Forest Management at a SAF accredited Forest Management Technologies program. I understand the history of the NF management through the years of the 60's-90's with my father as a TMA. I understand the NF as being born and raised surrounded by the Monongahela, George Washington, and Jefferson National Forests. I have hunted it, studied it, researched it, worked in it, taught in it, and partner within them. I have managed large private lands, managed them for multiple uses and have been hugely successful in providing sociological, economic and biological strategies together. I am more than a concerned citizen. It is done on the private side successfully, the political constraints are making it impossible to provide proper forest management on the federal side.

The structure of the National Forest is not a forest management organization at all. Many districts have lost or have limited experienced TMA, very few if any silviculturalists, and these last 20-30 years since the 80's have been detrimental to the forest health, wildlife habitat, stand diversity, resilience to pest/disease/fire/public damage. The movement of shutting down the national forest to actual forest management in order "save" all that public thinks they are saving, is resulting in serious biological and ecological degradation.

We can talk the financial argument, we can talk the detrimental community level results in jobs, funding back to schools and roads, etc. We can even talk the protection of wildland fire. But let's talk about all of those things that society says the National Forests are for: Recreation, wildlife, and environmental protections.

Recreation, sounds great. Open forests, large trees, trails, no understory to hamper viewing. Success...but wasn't there a division back in what the 1910-1920 in which the statement of "the Greatest Good for the Greatest Number" made the preservationist develop the National Park Service? At that time there was a distinct separation between why the National Forests were developed to be used...today those two opposing view agencies have become one. Recreation..successful though not paying the bills.

Wildlife, does not sound great! No stand structure, over mature timber producing less mass, dense crowns shading forest floors causing no regeneration for browse. This is the source of pushing many timbersales through now and the only way that the NF can title a sale so that the public will "approve". But 10 acre harvest units aren't paying the bills and are not making a large enough difference on the health and value of the wildlife habitat on the NF. Many areas would be a recreation boom around hunting seasons. Now these areas are trickles of users as the hunting and wildlife values are very minimal to that of non industrial and industrial forests.

Environmental Benefits...reduced. Carbon productivity of over mature, slower growth, higher health hazards are far shorter than those of productive forests. Water absorption is minor reduction, soil retention maintains although the lack of regenerating vegetation results in expose soil. Throw fire in the mix and we all know what happens. The key in environmental concerns is the reduction in stand structure, stand diversity, forest health, and resilience to over abundant pest and disease attacks.

I am a huge support of multiple-use management of all forests that includes harvesting of forest products in the plan. It is a must, our forests cannot live sustainably without it, and the health of our planet is a direct factor in the health of our forests! The national forest system needs to decide if they want to get back to why they were formed in the first place? Or dissolve completely into one agency with the National Park Service?

There is a direct need for the national forest to provide "the greatest good to the greatest number"!