

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/26/2018 7:05:17 PM

First name: eric

Last name: bowman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: RE:Robinson After looking at the maps I had a few reactions. First-the Timber people and the Arch might work together more often -- a large number of long landings are proposed on top of archeological sites. Not the best method of preserving the sites but interesting "planning"--the SHPO wants sites preserved and the forest plans to destroy them. I realize there's a graphics problem , that the symbols used to represent the landings (and other things) are not the same scale as the map. The proposed buffer zones would in most cases displace any log landing on/too near the site.Perhaps the Timber shop expects that the compromised customized buffer zones on offer will shrink to non-existence-- the best compromise would be to move the landing away from the site location. Landing sites are flexible, arch sites are not. They do not regenerate, grow back or....well...grow on trees.Not what the SHPO's office expects of the forest. Arch sites are once and only events-once destroyed-always. The SHPO's office sees the Forest,among other things,as a repository of archaeological information Owing to the fact that development has been sporadic,not as wide spread and generally not as environmentally destructive as large scale construction off-Forest.

The area of this project-Robinson-has a large number of the north 1/2s 18th century farm sites in the cross-hairs. These date from the time when most of the areas towns were first chartered. Standing buildings from that era are largely gone. They are represented in the Forest by various cellarholes/farm sites. One might hope that the Forest would have a bit more interest in the existing small population of old sites-evidently not as they get their fair share of proposed landings.The state would prefer a 200ft buffer.While this seems large-distance from activity and the fact that a large number of sites are multi-component and can cover a fair amount of ground. Some sites might be small enough to be protected by something smaller. Other aspects of the larger Project will be affected/affect arch sites as well. If you play by the rules and use the 200ft. buffer the planned road work-permanent and temporary-will be foreclosed as there are sites within that distance on all the routes. The construction of landings as well-in fact a number of them are re-used landings that have already destroyed features of nearby sites. Rec projects will potentially chip in with their portion of damage. A jump-off point for a permanent road and bike trail are located a)near a Historic site b)a prehistoric site c)a site that local gossip has indicated as a source of artifacts....an area your Arch. might want to look at shovel in hand.

Most GMNF non-arch."field" employees have no sense what-so-ever of what a "site" is or what features make up a "site", therefor don't know what does/doesn't need protection, but you would think that "planning" would reflect some recognition of the law and the SHPO's interest, beyond hope evidently. Sporadic protection has been the norm and seems set to continue.