

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/24/2023 12:00:00 PM

First name: Steve

Last name: Ahmann

Organization: Pacific Forestlands, LLC

Title: Managing Partner

Comments: We are a privately held, family-owned timber company and by using the ONX app we discovered that the PNWT has trespassed across two of our 40 acre conjoined private timber parcels since it was mapped out in 2011. We contacted Becky Blanchard, the program director, last October (2022), but she has not gotten back to us with any answers to our questions (now end of March, 2023). We hope to hear more from her about our concerns.

My family enjoys the outdoors: hiking, skiing, backpacking and hunting regularly. Your proposed trail currently crosses our working timberlands. Even in the summary of the draft comprehensive plan, paragraph 1, private land owners are not specifically mentioned. Are we considered a "rural working landscape?" Please tell the truth. In fact, although your comprehensive plan says that you have been in contact with private land owners, the list of "companies" has no (Zero) private land owners. Rather, they are either trail, wilderness, or wildlife organizations, tribes, or other government agencies. We believe that the private landowners, the taxpayers, LLC's, small Companies, Family Limited Partnerships, and so on, have been omitted from contact.

We have several concerns and comments. Page 9 of the Comprehensive Plan states that "the US will not acquire, for the PNWT scenic trail lands outside the exterior boundary of any federally managed area without the consent of the owner of the land or interest in land." Does "acquire" mean purchase or condemn and use? We were never contacted or consulted about the use of our land for the trail system. Without our permission, the trail, which currently exists(!) is trespassing on our land. We try to stop trespassers from coming onto our land here and on other parcels that we own. We need to do this to protect it!

Your Comp Plan states (on page 10) that "the proposed trail planning corridor is generally a minimum of 1 mile wide (0.5 mile on either side of the trail)". One mile? Good heavens! This would adversely affect our timber property's value (plus the other 2-40 acre parcels) and basically condemn the use of our private property for logging, or even accessing by vehicle. The Comp Plan describes far more than a 3' wide backpacker's trail: it includes campsites, shelters and public use facilities (see #3 pg 10). Again, this is not just a 3' trail: this is a mile wide swath of condemning our land for possible use as the Trails Coalition sees fit. I repeat: Outhouses, campsites, shelters wherever they see fit up to a half mile away from the trail!

Such a condemnation of a 1 mile wide authority would threaten our right to conduct logging, build roads, plant trees and manage our property. Most likely, we would not be able to practice forestry and logging on our land at all because the Comp Plan calls for that mile wide "no touch" area along the path. Currently, WA Department of Natural Resources is the governing body that issues permits and enforcement of forest practice laws. We don't need another department (especially a federal department) that would most likely disallow us from practicing our business of logging and forest regrowing. My family has owned this property for over 70 years and hopes to continue to practice the business of providing a renewable resource.

There is also a concern about liability for us with hikers visiting our property. We are very familiar with how people can misbehave in the woods near trailheads. Parking, overnight trailers and RV's, gate crashing, garbage dumping, fires, and motorized ATV's and motorcycles are a constant battle. We currently have folks who just pull off the trail and build campfires, toss garbage and human waste without any concern about who might own the property or whether there's a chance of creating a forest fire. It only takes a few people to ruin a good thing for the other 95% who behave themselves. In addition to the degradation of the land from campsites, erosion, fires, and random human misbehavior, who will provide enforcement of normal rules? Forest Service? Sheriff's department? Us? Who will service the trail and all appurtenances? You can see that our concerns are many. How would you feel if you had our property and the Forest Service secretly planned to have jurisdiction over a

one mile swath across your land?

Our other concerns are numerous: There's no revenue in this for us. Nothing. This is a condemnation of our privately-owned timberland. Who will keep the motorized traffic out? Will we be able to continue to build gates, put up signs, use security cameras and other tools to thwart trespassers? Why haven't you contacted Blodell Timber Company, our privately held neighbors? They have plenty of land that this plan will affect. You folks really have not done a good job of contacting the real land owners when I see your list of public and agency involvement. In fact, there are very few real land owners other than agencies. Your proposed plan is a hot mess that will most likely condemn and control our timberlands with no consideration for us.

We believe it is important that your plan reconsiders relocating the trail so that it is off our property.

Attachment: USDA PNST Detail Map, with commenter note on specific location on map