

## Appendix F – Issue Tracking Worksheet

Proposal: Misery Lake Timber and Fuels Management Projects Environmental Assessment

Responsible Official: John Buehler, District Ranger

Date: June 5, 2008

Table 1 - Summary of Letters/Comments Received

	<b>Comment Letter Name</b>	<b>Tracking Description (source)</b>
1	US Air Force	AF
2	Riley Creek Lumber Company	RC
3	The Lands Council, Kettle Range Conservation Group, Upper Columbia River Chapter of the Sierra Club, Ecology Center, National Forest Protection Alliance	TLC
4	John Chantry	JC
5	Liz Johnson-Gebhardt	LJG
6	Jeff Connolly	Connolly
7	Ken Oliver	KO
8	Sherman Norton	SN
9	The Northeast Washington Forestry Coalition	NEWFC
10	David Anderson	DA
11	Rick DeAngelo	RD
12	Forest Service	FS

Table 2 – Summary of Issues

The following comments were received during the original scoping period in 2004.

Issue No.	Preliminary Issues As presented by the commenter	Source	Clarified Issue Statement	Significant Issue? YES/NO	Measure
1	Protection of soil resources	FS	Proposed treatments have the potential to decrease soil productivity; project design should reduce or minimize compaction, sedimentation, displacement and erosion	Yes	Direct, indirect & cumulative effects to soil
2	Treatment of noxious weed populations	FS	Proposed treatments have the potential to spread or introduce noxious weed populations; project design should prevent, reduce, or minimize spread of noxious weeds.	Yes	Direct, indirect & cumulative effects to noxious weeds
3	New specified road construction	FS	There is disagreement between members of the public as to whether proposed new roads should remain open for public use or that there should be either no increase, or a decrease, in open road miles within the project area.	Yes	Miles of new road construction combined with miles of road closure & obliteration
4	Regeneration harvest	FS	The Lands Council and Conservation Northwest members contend that regeneration harvest systems create areas with insufficient residual stocking and the resulting units are aesthetically unacceptable.	Yes	Acres of regeneration harvest; Direct, indirect & cumulative effects to scenery management objectives
5	Protect AF investment in the road system.	AF	Whether or not the proposed action will require the AF to do additional work to protect their improvements.	No	Forest road maintenance standards are outside scope of this project.
6	Allow AF use of new and temporary roads, especially if they access suitable training areas (<35% slope, near water).	AF	Will the existing & new roads in the area remain available for use by the AF following completion of the proposed action?	Yes	Amount of road remaining as open or restricted following completion of project activities.

<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Preliminary Issues As presented by the commenter</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Clarified Issue Statement</b>	<b>Significant Issue? YES/NO</b>	<b>Measure</b>
7	Allow AF access on any newly gated roads.	AF	See response to issue #6.	Yes	Same as previous response.
8	After harvest is complete, allow AF to use log-landing areas for temporary winter shelter sites, or for helicopter landing zones.	AF	See response to issue #6.	Yes	Same as previous response.
9	Limit log haul during winter if it conflicts with winter training.	AF	Whether or not the proposed action will affect winter survival school training.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to special uses.
10	Allow use of MA-6 and -8 over the threshold for winter training within the Parker Lake closure.	AF	Increase accessibility in the Parker Lake Closure by the USAF during the winter use period.	No	Outside the scope of this project.
11	Coordinate helicopter logging with the 36 Rescue Flight to alleviate conflicts.	AF	Maintain safe operating conditions for helicopters belonging to both USAF and timber sale purchaser.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to special uses.
12	Reroute the 2700005 road to allow for large truck access down to the BPA power lines.	AF	See response to issue #6	Yes	Amount of road remaining as open or restricted following completion of project activities.
13	Clear the edges of the existing landing zones for safer helicopter landings.	AF	Improve safety during USAF use of the area.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to special uses.
14	Protect the power and phone lines along Ruby Creek road, which service the Ruby Command Post.	AF	Whether proposed activities in the project area protect existing improvements.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to special uses.
15	Clear trees along the 2700004 and 005 roads for snow plowing and storage.	AF	Improve safety during USAF use of the area.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to special uses.
16	Create additional turnouts on the roads for safer travel.	AF	Improve safety during USAF use of the area.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to special uses.

<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Preliminary Issues As presented by the commenter</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Clarified Issue Statement</b>	<b>Significant Issue? YES/NO</b>	<b>Measure</b>
17	Create more road access into section 16 within the Parker Lake closure - a good training area with limited access.	AF	Whether or not additional road should be kept available for survival school training.	Yes	Amount of road remaining as open or restricted following completion of project activities.
18	For training purposes, clean up slash in areas <35% slope, near roads.	AF	Whether or not areas <35% slope along roads will have project slash removed.	Yes	How much area of <35% slope will have project-related slash treated.
19	Concerned with fuel build-up in the watershed.	RC	Whether or not the proposed action will reduce excessive fuel build-up.	Yes	Acres treated for fuel reduction.
20	Support aggressive commercial and noncommercial harvesting.	RC	They support the FS harvesting timber.	No	Statement of opinion.
21	“...having a commercial timber sale is the last activity this area needs and should have only one alternative...”	TLC	No commercial timber sales on National Forest System Lands	No	This is opinion of letter-writer (conjecture).
22	Would like to see several noncommercial logging alternatives fully analyzed.	TLC	Whether or not an alternative with only noncommercial activities would meet the purpose & need.	No	Outside the scope of this project.
23	The EA must provide a condition class map along with proposed unit treatment prescriptions.	TLC	Include a condition class map and proposed unit treatment prescriptions in the EA.	No	Unit prescriptions are located in appendix A and condition class map is located in appendix B of the EA.
24	Commercial logging units should be dropped from the proposal, or treatment prescriptions changed to precommercial thinning and underburning.	TLC	No commercial timber sales on National Forest System Lands.	No	Statement of opinion.
25	WUI commercial thinning is unproductive and will not reduce the threat of wildfires.....	TLC	No commercial timber sales on National Forest System Lands.	No	Statement of opinion.

<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Preliminary Issues As presented by the commenter</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Clarified Issue Statement</b>	<b>Significant Issue? YES/NO</b>	<b>Measure</b>
26	Propose a maximum tree size limit of 8 to 10 dbh for trees to be logged.	TLC	Do not cut any trees greater than 8 to 10 inches dbh.	No	Statement of opinion.
27	Disclose previous landslides in the project area.	TLC	Whether or not project activities are proposed for areas with unstable soils.	Yes	Addressed as part of direct, indirect, & cumulative effects in the soils section of chapter 3.
28	Do not rely on INFISH as a magical sediment shield.	TLC	Whether or not INFISH is a good measure of sediment protection.	No	This is opinion of letter-writer; analysis of INFISH is beyond scope of this project.
29	“...options to truly restore this area should be examined in a range of alternatives that balance an investment in resources with restoration outcomes.”	TLC	Whether or not the range of alternatives consider other resources along with restoration outcome.	Yes	Addressed as part of direct, indirect, & cumulative effects for all resources and all alternatives.
30	“...should disclose the effects of increased noxious weeds on wildlife habitat, fire hazard, restoration efforts, sensitive plant species, and soils.”	TLC	Proposed treatments have the potential to spread or introduce noxious weed populations; project design should prevent, reduce, or minimize spread of noxious weeds.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to noxious weeds, wildlife, fuels, sensitive plants, and soils.
31	Concerned about a dispersed recreation site located on the Ruby Creek Rd. – either cleanup site and maintain as a monitored camping location, or close off and obliterate the site.	DA	The Forest Service should provide appropriate maintenance for dispersed sites or eliminate the sites.	No	Beyond the scope of this project.
<b>The following comments were received after NEWFC formally requested to collaborate on the project in 2006.</b>					
32	Would like to see some improvement of forage and hiding cover.	JC	Whether or not the proposed action will decrease winter cover and hiding cover within big game winter range.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to big game winter range.
33	In favor of implementing thinning projects.	JC	Supports commercial harvest on National Forest System land.	No	Statement of opinion.
34	Concerned about all the restrictions and constraints put on logging operations.	Connolly	Do not impose additional restrictions on logging operations.	No	Statement of opinion.

<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Preliminary Issues As presented by the commenter</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Clarified Issue Statement</b>	<b>Significant Issue? YES/NO</b>	<b>Measure</b>
35	Encourage the use of stewardship contracting for fuels management and forest restoration service work.	LJG	In favor of using stewardship contracting.	No	Statement of opinion.
36	Additional winter range for wildlife is unneeded.	KO	Whether or not the proposed action will increase winter cover within big game winter range.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to big game winter range.
37	Using winter range to keep the public from recreation is unacceptable.	KO	Whether or not the Forest Service will keep roads open for public access, and miles of open road available for public use.	Yes	Miles of new road construction combined with miles of road closure & obliteration; Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to big game winter range.
38	Putting up barriers after each timber cut is not what our public wants.	KO	Whether or not the Forest Service will keep roads open for public access, and miles of open road available for public use.	Yes	Amount of road remaining as open or restricted following completion of project activities.
39	Would like to see aspen come back.	KO	In favor of promoting aspen regeneration.	No	Statement of opinion.
40	Concerned the FS has a different view of protecting wolves than the Fish and Wildlife Service does.	KO	Would like both Forest Service & Washington Fish & Wildlife Service to use same guidelines for managing wolf populations and habitat.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to gray wolf.
41	The world is not going to end if there's a little soil disturbance, disturbance is good for growing natural regeneration.	RD	Whether or not soil condition will be impaired as a result of harvest activities.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to soil.
42	Consider adding a drift fence along the powerline corridor in section 3 to restrict cattle movement into areas opened up by timber harvest and fuel reduction activities.	SN	Whether or not the proposed action will reduce natural barriers to cattle movement	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to grazing.

Issue No.	Preliminary Issues As presented by the commenter	Source	Clarified Issue Statement	Significant Issue? YES/NO	Measure
43	Same as above, for section 4. Would like FS to consider leaving harvest-related slash or treating units in a way that would prevent or discourage cattle movement through these areas.	SN	See response to issue #42	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to grazing.
44	Would like to have better access to a holding corral in section 15. Consider extending a proposed new road in section 16 further southeast to connect into the powerline access road. If that's not possible, consider making the relocated portion of the 2700005 rd in section 21, to a standard that he could use for hauling cattle into and out of the area.	SN	Whether or not the proposed action will limit the permittee's access to a holding corral in section 15.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to grazing.
45	Drift fencing shall be reconstructed as to the needs of the permittee.	SN	Whether or not the proposed action will reduce barriers to cattle movement.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to grazing.
46	Concerning new road in section 21 – consider moving road to higher elevation to avoid substantial earth disturbance.	SN	Whether or not the proposed location met soil and access concerns.	Yes	Road construction and decommissioning proposed for the project; Direct, indirect & cumulative effects to soils.
47	Concerning new road originating in section 10 – this road must be gated and existing drift fence should be replaced with fence in accordance with Washington State law. Fencing/funding could be included in terms of logging contract.	SN	Whether or not the proposed action will reduce barriers to cattle movement.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to grazing.

Issue No.	Preliminary Issues As presented by the commenter	Source	Clarified Issue Statement	Significant Issue? YES/NO	Measure
48	Concerning extension of road 2700002 in section 9 – this road and proposed treatments will eliminate natural barriers allowing livestock access to areas not historically used. This will require fencing along eastern and northern boundaries to prevent livestock from drifting onto the state highway and pvt. landowners.	SN	See response to issue #47.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to grazing.
49	Concerning new road in section 23 – this road is opening up access to areas that livestock have not previously penetrated, bordering private land. Fencing issues are once again a concern.	SN	See response to issue #47.	Yes	Direct, indirect, & cumulative effects to grazing.
50	Concerned about amount of shelterwood regeneration harvest and large openings.	NEWFC	Whether or not the proposed action will create clearcuts.	Yes	Acres by treatment method.
51	Concerned about opening size.	NEWFC	Whether or not the proposed action will create clearcuts.	Yes	Acres by treatment method.
52	Concerned about residual stocking following regeneration harvest.	NEWFC	Whether or not the proposed action will create clearcuts and will meet scenery management objectives.	Yes	Acres by treatment method, and Direct, indirect & cumulative effects to scenery management.
53	The minimum residual stocking should be 40 tpa after harvest and before fire.	NEWFC	Members of NEWFC would like the Forest Service to retain fully stocked stands following harvest activities.	No	Statement of opinion.

I have reviewed this and agree with the issues, their significance, and units of measure.

*/s/ John Buehler*

---

JOHN BUEHLER  
District Ranger