

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/30/2016 12:00:00 AM

First name: Stuart

Last name: Buck

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear Forest Managers

After reading the 2016 Colville Forest Plan Revision I have three concerns.

1. In regards to road density you state there is an average of 4.3 miles of road per square mile and the preferred density would be about 2.5 miles per square mile.

We may have 4.3 miles of road pre square mile, however at least 50% of that is made up of closed roads, so that would put the forest currently at the desired level of accessible road density.

The plan also states that the public is demanding more access to the forest. If there was a system present that would allow the closed roads to be opened for periods of time there would be less need to create new roads. At the present the only way to get a road opened is by commercial timber harvest. This may not be the official stance, but that is reality.

The current road system is adequate to access most of the available timber, especially considering the lack of forest personnel available to implement management.

Roads have the most impact to the forest of any activity and creating new ones seems like a dangerous approach. I believe this was addressed in the 1988 plan and it should be here. Short road extensions and increased management of currently roaded areas would be my approach to road density. Creating new roads and removing others would not lower road densities, where roads are adversely impacting water quality it may be beneficial to eliminate them. This would allow for5 limited new road creation, but only if the new road could be proven to have no major impact to other resources.

2. Given the current silvacultural approach to forest health and management, logging under these prescriptions benefits forest resilience and lowers the chance of stand replacing fire, so I have little concern about the broadened timber management areas such as general and focused restoration, again roads to access al of it does concern me.

Also eliminating the eastside plan 21" DBH rule is concerning. ON the dry Republic district especially, trees 21 DBH and larger are old growth eligible and would continue to be some of the healthiest available if restoration and fire are implemented. East of the Kettle Crest, trees can reach 21 DBH at an earlier age, especially with management. It may be appropriate to continue managing these larger trees on that part of the forest as long as it is proven they do not warrant old growth protection.

Wilderness designation in alternative "P" seems to lack much thought. The 'proposed action' alternative seems more of a balanced approach to protection. However I would suggest trading the twin sisters area for the 13 mile area. Make twin sisters back country and 13 mile proposed wilderness. The tribe may object to this, but management of 13 mile seems to be impractical and fire here inevitable, the same is true for twin sisters, but 13 mile is much more remote. The area shown as wilderness north of Sherman Pass could also be considered given it's remoteness and its lack of management options. I would agree with the proposed wilderness on the east side of the forest.

3. While I could not get a clear explanation of what activities would be allowed in the backcountry motorized areas, I have no major issues. with this designation if motorized use id properly enforced.

There is one backcountry motorized unit I would strongly disagree with however, that would be the large area along the Albion Hill Rd. This block is just east of the Kettle Crest and would contribute greatly to noise pollution along the Crest Trail north of Sherman Pass. This motorized block would degrade the purpose of the Kettle Crest Special Interest Area and should be dropped form this designation.

I applaud your dedication and efforts to provide a new forest plan. Please strongly consider the concerns I have

presented.