

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/25/2018 7:21:27 PM

First name: John

Last name: Hess

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I have reviewed April 24th newsletter from the USFS and the two page "All about scoping: a Guide" and the 10 page GMUG National Forests: Forest Plan Revision: Scoping and I believe you are asking for comments on the last document by June 2nd. This last Document includes: 1. Forest Plan Vision, Roles and Contributions, 2. Key Needs for Change and 3. Management Area Framework. I will comment on this last document below. If you are asking for comments about other issues, please advise me and tell me what other issues you are asking for comments about by June 2nd. Since I will be out of the country after May 17th, please let me know about other issues I should comment on prior to May 17th.

Comments:

Forest Plan Vision, Roles and Contributions

1. Page 1 begins a discussion about Why the GMUG Matters. The two major discussion topics are "Public Enjoyment" and "Commodity Use and Community Connections." I agree these two topics are important. While there is one paragraph that discusses game species, that attract sportsmen, there is no major topic area called "Wildlife Diversity" or "A Home for Wildlife." In these days of loosing biodiversity because people are displacing wildlife and because people caused climate change is forcing wildlife to move higher or out of the area, I think this a major topic area that should be included in "Why the GMUG Matters."

Based on analyses of the nation's best-studied groups of plants and animals-including birds, mammals, fish, reptiles, amphibians and vascular plants-scientists at NatureServe estimate that about a third of all U.S. species are at risk of extinction. That percentage translates to "more than 8,500 of our best-known plant and animal species," says Bruce Stein, the National Wildlife Federation's associate vice president of conservation science and author of Precious Heritage: The Status of Biodiversity in the United States.

The GMUG needs to do its part to maintain biodiversity.

2. Maintain the Diversity of Plant and Animal Communities. This section gets specific enough to say "... maintain existing, relatively unfragmented big game habitat..." This section should be expanded to say for all forest wildlife. It should also go on to say maintain and create corridors so wildlife can travel between habitats through the maze of trails, roads, mines, campgrounds, clear cuts and other human barriers.

3. Incorporate Best Available Science, Update Existing Law and Policy. It seems like this section should acknowledge rising temperatures and the impact of warming, not only because it is warmer but because people will want to go where temperatures not as high, on all of the flora and fauna of the National Forest.

4. Build an Accessible, Useful Plan. Hooray! There is a lot of common sense in this section.

5. Special Areas and Unique Landscapes. The discussion says: Management emphasis is tailored toward the unique features of the particular area. It then goes on to say: "Not suitable for timber production or harvest." This last sentence seems too specific. Why not also say: not suitable for mechanized trails, not suitable for commercial grazing, no suitable for ski areas, not suitable for... etc. etc.

6. Timber harvesting is mentioned many times but there is no list of issues to consider when thinking about what lands should be used for timber harvest and what lands are unsuitable, except for the few times you say timber harvesting would be unsuitable. Bring all the pros and cons together in one place to be evaluated by the public. One con would be the impact to biodiversity. I recently read about a researcher who recorded the sound of birds and insects in a forest and then recorded them again after "thinning". The amount of sound decreased

dramatically. More than the percentage of thinning. If biodiversity will be a goal of the whole plan, then this type of impact should be considered in timber harvesting.

Thank for the opportunity to comment.