

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/30/2023 8:05:33 PM

First name: Carol

Last name: Beckman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The operation should not disturb any Forest Service land that is not already disturbed from the quarry operation. My understanding is that the plan is to use materials only from previously disturbed land. It is important that this is observed and enforced. Some projects where land is not supposed to be disturbed ends up being disturbed during operations (ex, summit house construction was supposed to not disturb certain areas, but debris was piled on tundra transplants in that area anyway). The reclamation plan (p 5) says a goal is to minimize new disturbance. Instead, it should not cause any new disturbance.

The plan (p 6) says it will strip material from undisturbed areas. This is disturbing. This plan should not use undisturbed areas, but should keep them undisturbed.

Stockpiling should be on disturbed land, not in undisturbed areas.

The resulting shape of the land should look natural. For example, a uniform slope is unlikely to look natural. The shape should be adequately haphazard to look natural.

Roads should be restored in such a way that they do not look like old roads and so that they are unusable as roads. Revegetation alone, leaving the road bench, might restore the land, but would invite continued use as a road.

Reclamation on Forest Service land should be such that it discourages user-created non-system trails. While not certain, the plan is for recreation on the adjoining quarry land, if the city accepts the reclamation and donation. With trails on the adjacent city land, a temptation to users to extend trails onto Forest Service land seems likely. The end result of the reclamation on Forest Service land should discourage user-created trails. This would be most important near the land where trails are planned on the potential donation property and on the property currently owned by the city.

Tree planting should try to result in a natural look. For example, uniform spacing between trees does not look natural.

Revegetation should accommodate the bighorn sheep herd, especially on Forest Service land. With the plan for trails and recreation on the city property and quarry property (if the city accepts the land), revegetation to accommodate trails makes sense. But the Forest Service land should be restored to favor the bighorn sheep. Whatever the CPW and Forest Service folks recommend for the sheep would be best, but what I have heard is that bighorn sheep prefer areas with wide open views. Vegetation, especially trees, should be planned with the bighorn sheep in mind.

Planted trees and seeds might need water to become established. The plan (p 8) says planting of trees and grass seed will not be supported by irrigation systems. It's important to monitor the site for several years and not release the bond until trees and other vegetation are established. Water might be needed to establish the trees and grasses.

I'm glad to see noxious weed monitoring and control included. It is important that this occurs. Revegetation areas are prone to noxious weeds. These can be monitored with the revegetation efforts to ensure success before the bond is released.

Erosion needs to be controlled while vegetation is established. Before vegetation is established, the dirt will be subject to quite a bit of erosion. Erosion gullies are likely, and need to be prevented, monitored for, and

controlled the entire time that vegetation is being established.

Thanks.