Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/22/2013 12:00:00 AM
First name: Allan
Last name: Sommarstrom
Organization:
Title:
Comments: DOCUMENTATION FORM

Date:Jan. 22, 2013Time: 9:15 – 10:00 amLocation: Seattle to S.O.
Type of Contact (Phone, Meeting, Teleconference): Phone Call
Name of Writer:Curtis Spalding
Participants: Curtis Spalding;
Allan Sommarstrom
6035 30th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115-7205
(206) 523-9755
Topic:Initial Questions About Finney Pre-Decisional EA
Objective:Improve Understanding of EA

Key Items or Agreement:
Allan received the EA in the mail, had started reviewing it, had some questions about it, and requested "the most patient person available" to talk to and answer them.
Acronyms and Jargon. He noted the EA's abundance of acronyms and jargon, which made it challenging to understand the material. I acknowledged this EA did not have a Glossary or List of Acronyms like some documents do.
Effectiveness. He said the premise of the EA appears to say we need to do something about spotted owl and marbled murrelet habitat. It is unclear beyond that if the activities will be effective. I indicated part of that is addressed in the Consequences and part would be addressed in the monitoring plan that is part of the Research Study Plan.
Cost – Benefit Ratio. He said the cost-benefit analysis is only minimally positive; and, it seems only relative to the Purchaser—but not necessarily to the American people, which is how it should be calculated and reported. I said that was a point he could make.
Acres Treated. The question of acres treated compared to the acres untreated was unclear. I called his attention to the Table 2-1 in the EA that on the bottom, summed up the acres treated compared to the total acres considered for treatment. I also pointed out Figure 2-1 that depicted how the Proposed Action included "Untreated Reference Units" (un-numbered polygons) as well as "Treated Reference Units" which receive Treatment "T," Typical Prescription. He indicated he sees value in acres untreated as control units.
Research Project. If it is a research project, he indicated there should be research plot and control plots. I said that would be part of the Research Study Plan.
Monitoring. He noticed that the public comments requesting monitoring were dismissed as "Non Key" in Appendix A, Scoping Analysis, and wondered why. There's a lot that needs to be done in this respect. He would like to see monitoring that occurs over time, not just a one-shot deal after the project. I said that also would be part of the Research Study Plan.
Use of Public Comments. Alan read from the EA cover letter which provided legal language for direction on commenting. But there was nothing describing if or how the Forest Service would use the public comments received. I said that appeared to be a valid point, and an oversight on our part, and that the Forest would review all the comments received, consider the substantive ones, and respond as appropriate in the Decision Notice, including a Response to Comments section.
I asked if these questions and comments were intended to go on the record as pre-decisional EA comments, and he said if there has been anything helpful to the analysis, then yes, he asked us to please consider them as comments.