

Appendix 1

30-Day Comment Period Input

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
1a	Frank Jeff Verito (e-mail)	<p>Your proposals to update the monitoring program are appreciated. However, you've fallen short on Item 5, regarding the status of visitor use, visitor satisfaction and progress toward meeting recreation objectives. So little of ONF is designated for preservation, the preserved acreage is being trampled. It's hard to find solitude in old growth portions of the forest. Too much is managed for hunting (grouse and deer) and for timber assaults.</p>	<p>The purpose of the administrative change for the monitoring program is not to change the way the landscape is managed, it is to ensure that the monitoring program is consistent with the required monitoring elements outlined in the 2012 Planning Rule. Monitoring for visitor use and visitor satisfaction was not included in the 2006 Forest Plan; it became a requirement as a result of the 2012 Planning Rule. The indicator for this monitoring question will reference the findings from National Visitor Use Monitoring. This framework includes monitoring for a variety of recreational experiences, including wilderness where preservation is emphasized.</p>
1b		<p>Our so-called mixed-use forest isn't managed for those who enjoy a natural experience. Human greed prevails. Even SPM, SPNM and WS Corridors aren't exempt. As a friend of mine said of ONF management, "They want it all!"</p>	<p>The monitoring program will continue to include the Monitoring Question 14 <i>"Is Forest Plan implementation consistent with the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum Objectives and Desired Conditions?"</i>, which will help us determine whether implementation of our Forest Plan provides for semi-primitive motorized and semi-primitive non-motorized recreational environments. In addition, the incorporation of the monitoring question outlined in the 2007 Comprehensive River Management Plan, now Monitoring Question 17, <i>"To what extent is Wild and Scenic River management contributing to protection and enhancement of the WSR value?"</i> will provide us information for whether management activities are achieving/maintaining desired conditions.</p>
1c		<p>Item 7 deals with meeting the "desired conditions," which gets to the crux of why the FP was so contested at the time of revision. The desired conditions are based on meeting logging quotas and assaulting thousands of aspen acres for a special interest group. My desired condition, and that of most citizens who aren't aware of the extent of ONF timber assaults, favor natural appearing forests. ONF management dedicates too many acres to early-successional species with little regard for those that rely on older habitat. ONF is simply not maintained according to the natural prescription of species that would occupy an undisturbed forest.</p>	<p>The commenter is referring to Monitoring Question 18: <i>"To what extent are forest management activities restoring vegetation composition and spatial landscape patterns and moving toward desired conditions at the Forest, management area and other appropriate landscape scales?"</i> The desired conditions are based on vegetative composition percentages outlined for each management area. This question would be answered via the following indicator: <i>"Comparison of current and desired percentages of forest types, by management area."</i></p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
1d		<p>Item 8, regarding the productivity of land, is geared toward optimizing the productivity of future timber assaults. I favor logging and believe in the science, and it's essential that we maintain the acreage that's designated for logging in the most efficient, productive manner such that as much as possible can be managed for old growth preservation (much more than currently). An ONF manager who addressed the public at a Sierra Club meeting, held at Peter White Public Library in 1992, said this would be roughly half the loggable acreage. What a lie that turned out to be!</p>	<p>The commenter is referring to Monitoring Question 10: <i>"Is Forest Plan implementation resulting in impacts that may substantially and permanently impair the productivity of the land?"</i> The 2012 Planning Rule requires this monitoring; it is specific to lands suited for timber harvest as outlined in the question's Indicator <i>"Extent of soil disturbance affecting soil function and soil productivity on managed lands"</i>. This question does not address old growth. However, Monitoring Question 19 is being maintained, which states <i>"To what extent are old growth forest conditions being classified consistent with management area objectives?"</i> It is important to note that the Forest Plan's monitoring program is designed to track progress towards achieving or maintaining the Forest Plan's desired conditions. The monitoring questions themselves would not result in a change to the amount of old growth on the Ottawa.</p>
1e		<p>More contention arises when reviewing the monitoring questions. ONF management's idea of improving riparian habitat is to fell trees to enhance fishing while leaving unsightly stumps on the banks, and encouraging sedimentation from slopes. Design criterion favors logging as close as possible to riparian features. Adequate buffers aren't provided from either sedimentation or aesthetic standpoints.</p>	<p>We believe that the commenter is referring to the Indicators <i>"The extent of large woody material in streams."</i> and <i>"The extent of terrestrial large woody material provided (snags and down wood)."</i> of Monitoring Question 29 <i>"To what extent are the key habitat components in aquatic and terrestrial habitat being provided?"</i>. Providing these habitat components is an important step towards achieving desired conditions outlined in the Forest Plan.</p>
1f		<p>Item C deals with stream quality. If ONF management cared, the buffers would be wider. The protested use of pesticides only exacerbates the problem. I don't trust those chemicals in the water even if used according to instructions because the instructions are written by companies that hope to sell the greatest amount of product. It's wiser not to promote logging and other ONF activities that are the largest cause of NNIP introduction than to clear the invaders later at additional public expense.</p>	<p>Due to the commenter's reference of stream quality, we believe the commenter is referencing Indicator "c" of the Monitoring Question 26: <i>"What is the status of selected watershed conditions?"</i>. The Indicator states, <i>"Does the relative abundance, density, and species richness of EPT within sampled reaches indicate plan objectives for stream water quality and habitat are being obtained?"</i>. As outlined in the footnote for this indicator, it is referencing species of aquatic macroinvertebrates, specifically, mayflies, stoneflies and caddisflies.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
1g		<p>If the progress of improving stream quality is measured every 2-4 years, I don't recall seeing a report since the revision, and I've been on the mailing list non-stop since 1992 for all activities in all ONF RDs, including citizen comments received.</p>	<p>Monitoring and Evaluation Reports have been posted to the Ottawa's internet site since the 2006 Forest Plan Revision. They have been mailed out to the Forestwide mailing list in the past, and notices have been provided via the Ottawa Quarterly (e.g., Schedule of Proposed Actions).</p>
1h		<p>On Page 2 the question appears as to whether hardwood activities are promoting the regeneration of basswood, red oak, white pine and yellow birch. Nowhere is it stated whether some of these efforts will result in a greater number of old growth preserves. You provide a beautiful description, but it's all for not unless a decent number of the acres we've worked so hard to improve, at public expense, are preserved.</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing the Monitoring Question 11: "<i>Are northern hardwood forest management activities promoting the regeneration of mid-tolerant tree species, specifically basswood, red oak, white pine and yellow birch?</i>" Indicator b for this question does include the "<i>Difference in the number of seedling/sapling-sized, mid-tolerant tree species in managed and unmanaged northern hardwood forest stands.</i>" The creation of this monitoring question and indicator would not change the amount of old growth classified.</p>
1i		<p>Your question on Page 3 on "to what extent is management contributing to the conservation of TES and moving toward desired habitat conditions..." is well-taken. WHY DON'T WE ADDRESS THAT IN AN OBJECTIVE MANNER? Whose objectives are we truly trying to fulfill, those of logging interests, hunters and fishers, or those who'd like to see ONF restored to its pre-settlement state as closely as possible? Not enough emphasis is placed on species that require older habitat.</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing the Monitoring Question 31: "<i>To what extent is forest management contributing to the conservation of threatened and endangered species and moving toward desired habitat conditions and population trends for these species?</i>". The indicator for this question focuses on providing habitat for the Federally-threatened Kirtland's warbler, which would fulfill the recovery plan objectives for this species. This species requires early successional (young) jack pine habitat, and therefore this question does not emphasize mature habitat requirements. Several other questions outlined in Chapter 4 of the 2006 Forest Plan emphasize monitoring late-successional (mature) habitats.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
1j		<p>The next box deals with visitor satisfaction. I'm massively dissatisfied with most of my visits to the trashed ONF. Accessing decent OG has become increasingly difficult due to increased logging and decreased access. We're greeted by unsightly berms and gates. Usually, I can find a decent place to recreate, with no lights visible at night, but rarely does this occur at a natural-appearing site.</p>	<p>We believe the commenter is referencing the Monitoring Question 5: "What is the status of visitor use and visitor satisfaction?" The results of the National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM), which covers several facets of visitor use and satisfaction, will be used to provide information for this question's indicators. Results of past NVUM reports are available at: http://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/nvum/</p>
1k		<p>You mention restoring vegetation composition and spatial landscape patterns, which is great until I try to understand how this moves our forest toward any "desired condition" that those who favor nature would wish to see. Please restore vegetation composition and special landscapes toward the condition that we'd find in an undisturbed forest.</p>	<p>See Comment 1c. This administrative change only includes updating the monitoring program; it does not include modification of the desired conditions outlined in the Forest Plan. This type of action would require a formal revision of Forest Plan direction.</p>
1l		<p>To "restore vegetation composition" just to exploit it is better than nothing, but doesn't do the forest as much good as restoring the composition to preserve more acres than currently. The wording needs change because, as is, the words are too subject to interpretation. Greedy people interpret them differently than those who respect nature and natural processes.</p>	<p>See Comment 1c. As stated previously, the Monitoring Question is tied to the desired conditions. Vegetation composition percentages, if applicable, are located in the management area direction of the Forest Plan. Most management areas include percentages of northern hardwood, long-lived conifer, short-lived conifer and aspen/paper birch habitats, in addition percentages of old growth and permanent forest openings on the landscape. The Monitoring Question would help us determine how management activities are maintaining or progressing vegetation composition percentages to within the allowable ranges identified in the Forest Plan.</p>
1m		<p>On Table 2, the revised question is more specific but is no different than the original wording. In either case we need more objective studies of sedimentation, introduction of pesticides and aesthetic demise by an independent agency rather than wolves in the chicken coops. You're further asked to halt your timber assaults until this agency has completed cumulative effects studies.</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing Monitoring Question 28 "<i>To what extent is forest plan implementation affecting streams, lakes, ponds and wetlands and their associated riparian ecosystems?</i>". This question was updated to include streams, lakes and ponds to allow us to more effectively report on the results of monitoring we are already obtaining through our best management practices implementation and effectiveness monitoring, as outlined in this question's indicator.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
1n		<p>The first box on page 5 is spot on, that the FP implementation is moving toward the desired conditions for certain species according to the FP. The trouble is, those are the desired conditions of the FP authors and special interest groups, not the public at large. Those who opposed the exploitive philosophy of the FP were not given a fair opportunity to influence the Plan—reasoning on record.</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing Monitoring Question <i>"To what extent is forest plan implementation contributing or responding to the species of conservation concern and moving toward desired habitat conditions for these species?"</i> See Comment 3d.</p>
1o		<p>Some of your proposed monitoring questions to delete are not complete enough to begin with; thus, the incomplete portions are unlikely combined into other related questions. For example, how are trail closures affecting ONF owners' reasonable access to their forest or their ability to inspect the results of ONF timber assaults?</p>	<p>We believe that the commenter is referencing the deletion of Monitoring Question <i>"To what extent are road and trail closures effective in prohibiting unauthorized motor vehicle use?"</i> (previously reported as Monitoring Question 5c). This question will be answered through the indicator "Number of road closure barriers breached leading to unauthorized use.", which will be used to report information for the Monitoring Question 6: "How effective are forest management practices in managing OHV use for the protection of forest resources?"</p>
1p		<p>We agree there's no need to further examine the extent to which activities provide habitat for ruffed grouse. You're managing an incredibly disproportionate percent of what was intended to be a mixed use forest for this purpose, denying those of us who enjoy the sight of an old aspen stand.</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing the deletion of Monitoring Question <i>"To what extent are forest management activities providing habitat for Management Indicator Species (ruffed grouse)."</i> (previously reported as Monitoring Question 10b). As stated, this question is being dropped because the 2012 Planning Rule does not require monitoring of management indicator species. Management direction to provide habitat for management indicator species remains a part of the Forest Plan until a revision is completed to remove it.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
1q		<p>Three rectangles below, you're giving up on monitoring the extent to which public involvement is emphasized. Your public process is mere formality. Management pretends to "respond" our concerns only to keep the process moving forward without providing actual responses, much less resolution. The process hasn't improved one iota over the course of 23 years. The aftermaths of your decisions suggest that you provided opportunities for public input; however, with no chance to influence the outcome our time has been totally wasted (as well as that of the respondents' whom we're paying to waste our tax dollars).</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing the deletion of Monitoring Question "To what extent does the Forest emphasize agency, tribal and public involvement and intergovernmental coordination with federal, state, county governments and agencies?" (previously reported as Monitoring Question 11). As stated, there is no meaningful measure to show improvement over the lifetime of the Forest Plan; we are required to involve public and intergovernmental during our decision making processes. Dropping this question will not change our external communications or processes, which are required by laws, regulations, policies and Forest Plan direction.</p>
1r		<p>It's fitting that you'd delete the first question on Page 6 pertaining to what extent activities in SPNM areas have aligned with the Rec. Oppty. Objectives. There are no SP areas in ONF because they've all (to my knowledge) been compromised by timber assaults. The public expects SPs to be kept in a natural-appearing condition, meaning your fulfillment of ROSOs is egregiously poor. It's easier for ONF management to abandon the question or claim it's combined than to provide us our requested, denied and ignored opportunities.</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing the deletion of the Monitoring Question "<i>To what extent are Forest management activities in semi-primitive nonmotorized management areas in alignment with the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Objectives?</i>" (previously reported as Monitoring Question 15). This topic will be combined into Monitoring Question 14, "<i>Is Forest Plan implementation consistent with the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum Objectives and Desired Conditions?</i>", which will continue to monitor how the implementation of activities in semi-primitive non-motorized areas are consistent with the recreational opportunity spectrum for this area.</p>
1s		<p>You've also combined soil quality which cannot be adequate because nature's prescribed amount of CWD is not being introduced into the soil.</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing the deletion of the Monitoring Question "How is forest plan implementation affecting soil quality (by management system)?" (originally reported as Monitoring Question 29), which has been combined into the Monitoring Question 10, "Is Forest Plan implementation resulting in impacts that may substantially and permanently impair the productivity of the land?" This new question's indicator, "<i>Extent of soil disturbance affecting soil function and soil productivity on managed lands.</i>" will help monitor effects to soil quality.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
1t		<p>Your explanation as to what extent management provides ecological conditions to maintain viable populations is not clear. You write that the 2012 Planning Rule focuses on monitoring for ecological conditions..(as)...it relates to common species, not species monitoring. There must be quite a difference between “viable” populations and providing nature’s original prescription for the species that thrive in various habitats. Too much emphasis is placed on early-successional species.</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing the deletion of the Monitoring Question, "To what extent is forest management providing ecological conditions to maintain viable populations of native and desired non-native species? (a. Botany) (b. Breeding Bird Census) (c. Frogs) (d. Bobcat)." (originally reported as Monitoring Question 33). As outlined in the information sent for the 30 day comment period, the 2012 Planning Rule requires monitoring of eight elements, which includes 36 CFR 219.9(a)(5)(iii) <i>The status of focal species to assess the ecological conditions required under § 219.9.</i> and 36 CFR 219.9(a)(5)(iv) <i>The status of a select set of the ecological conditions required under § 219.9 to contribute to the recovery of federally listed threatened and endangered species, conserve proposed and candidate species, and maintain a viable population of each species of conservation concern.</i> Both of these monitoring elements are geared towards monitoring the maintenance/restoration of ecological conditions, which in turn, can provide information on the diversity of plant and animal communities. Species monitoring is no longer emphasized.</p>
1u		<p>You’re definitely correct in concluding that it’s not relevant to monitor how fire suppression tactics have been implemented relative to the threat posed to human life... The reason is, there is no wildfire urban-interface in the vast majority of ONF. Management uses wildfire risk as an excuse to log. Those who live in isolated areas, subject to the threat of wildfire, are urged to clear around their homes and have escape routes. Otherwise they’re free to relocate.</p>	<p>The commenter is referencing the deletion of Monitoring Question "How have fire suppression tactics been implemented on the Forest relative to the threat posed to human life, property, or threatened resources?" (originally reported as Monitoring Question 43. This question is being dropped because it is not relevant to Forest Plan implementation. This does not invalidate the wildland urban interface that exists on the Ottawa as identified by community wildfire protection plan areas or the Federal Register. The use of wildland fire to maintain/mimic natural processes will still be monitored.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
1v		<p>Regarding appendix 2 on the Sturgeon River Wilderness, whether a section is named a RNA is immaterial so long as the acreage is preserved. The amendment should be modified to propose appropriate buffer zones to our wilderness areas and WS corridors which are effectively shrinking on account of increased use, and are destined for higher usage in the generations ahead. Instead, ONF management endeavors to conduct assaults up to the borders before they can be saved for the children of tomorrow. Just a little vision along these lines might go a long way.</p>	<p>The Forest Service does not manage buffer zones adjacent to, or around, wilderness areas. For wilderness, the Forest Service Manual (2300- Recreation, Wilderness, and Related Resource Management, Chapter 2320, Wilderness Management, 2320.3 – Policy 5) states that because wilderness does not exist in a vacuum, activities can be considered adjacent to wilderness boundaries. Corridor areas encompassing the wild and scenic rivers were revised and incorporated into the Forest Plan through a 2007 amendment. As outlined in the document sent for the 30-day comment period, the administrative change corrects the Forest Plan's language for the RNA, which was already approved in 2012. The RNA does not change the acreage of wilderness managed.</p>
1w		<p>You work in our forest and you're paid to be there. Most of us have to travel a long way to ONF, during our rare vacation time. This explains the animosity I feel toward ONF management. All I've ever asked for is that Management provide a balance.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
1x		<p>Where were you when the latest FP revision was conducted? To state that "...the public was an important part of the entire FP revision process..." is egregiously untrue in my opinion. By signing the scoping document, you've taken ownership of it. My appeal was never properly resolved, and nothing will resolve it to my satisfaction until the appeals officer and selected members of the ID Team are thrown in jail where they're free to rot with my blessings.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Information pertaining to public involvement during Forest Plan revision, and how the public comments were considered in the analysis process, is located in Chapters 1 through 4 of its Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), the FEIS's Appendix J and the FEIS's Record of Decision. Our records show that the commenter's appeal of the Record of Decision was addressed in April 2007.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
2	Don Helsel (e-mail)	Mr. Helsel expressed concern about the deletion of Monitoring Questions shown here. He believed that the themes of these questions should remain in the monitoring program. Clarifications were provided (e.g., the topics would remain addressed) as stated here. No further comment was received.	<p>Concerns about the deletion of the following Monitoring Questions were expressed; rationale is provided after each set of questions:</p> <p>(1) "What are the effects of OHVs on the physical and social environment?", "To what extent are road and trail closures effective in prohibiting unauthorized motor vehicle use?" and "To what extent are OHVs producing impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitats?" (originally reported as Monitoring Questions 5a, 5c and 38, respectively). Monitoring Questions 5 (What is the status of visitor use and visitor satisfaction?), 6 (How effective are forest management practices in managing OHV use for the protection of forest resources?) and 13 (What amount of road routes and recreation trails are designated open for OHV riding and provide connections to other public trails?) will address the same monitoring topics.</p> <p>(2) Concerns about the deletion of the following Monitoring Questions were also voiced: "To what extent is the Forest providing a range of motorized and nonmotorized recreation opportunities that incorporate diverse public interests yet achieve applicable management area objectives and desired conditions?" and "To what extent are Forest management activities in semi-primitive nonmotorized management areas in alignment with the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Objectives?" (originally reported as Monitoring Questions 14 and 15). Updated Monitoring Question 15 will address the same monitoring topic ("Is Forest Plan implementation consistent with the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum Objectives and Desired Conditions?").</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
3a	Waltrud Brinkman (Friends of Sylvania) (e-mail)	<p>The proposed deletion of 2 out of the 3 questions under the Resource Area "Recreation: Off-Highway Vehicles" and deletion of the only question under the Resource Area "Wildlife: Off-Highway Vehicles" would leave only a question on the amount of road open for OHVs and a general question about management; but none about OHV effects. These deletions would result in an inability to tell whether the impact of OHVs on various resources is increasing or decreasing over time. OHV use is one of the things that can cause the most serious resource damage to the Forest. We would prefer that these important questions not be deleted.</p>	<p>We believe the commenters are referencing the Monitoring Questions "What are the effects of OHVs on the physical and social environment? "; "To what extent are road and trail closures effective in prohibiting unauthorized motor vehicle use?" and "<i>To what extent are OHVs producing impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitats?</i>" The information once captured under these questions will now be incorporated through Monitoring Questions "What is the status of visitor use and visitor satisfaction?" and "How effective are forest management practices in managing OHV use for the protection of forest resources?"</p>
3b		<p>It would have made our review of the updates and comparison with the original 44 questions easier if the questions had been numbered. The original 44 questions are at least grouped according to "Resource Area" but even that was omitted in Tables 1-3 of the "Appendices"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resource Area "Non-native Invasive Species": Making the question more specific by including the word "monitoring" would, in our view, improve this question - Under the same Resource Area ("Non-native Invasive Species") a question similar to the one under the Resource Area "Insects and Disease" would, in our view, be a valuable addition. Such as "Are aquatic and terrestrial invasive species population levels compatible with objectives for restoring or maintaining healthy forest conditions?" 	<p>Comment noted.</p>
3c		<p>In reference to the proposed Monitoring Question: "<i>What is the status of visitor use and visitor satisfaction?</i>"</p> <p>Comment - Too broad: Answer would not tell anything about how areas that are managed differently on the Ottawa (wilderness, semi-primitive, non-motorized areas, general Forest campgrounds, general Forest campgrounds, general Forest fishing opportunities, general Forest hunting opportunities, non-motorized opportunities such as hiking, x-c skiing) are meeting wth needs of specific recreationists. In our view, breaking this questions into 3-4 more specific questions would product more meaningful answers.</p>	<p>See Comment 1j. The National Visitor Use Monitoring would help us collect information needed for this Monitoring Question's indicators. Monitoring Questions 14 ("Is Forest Plan implementation consistent with the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum Objectives and Desired Conditions? ") and 16 ("<i>Is wilderness management contributing to improvement or preservation of wilderness character and values?</i>") would also be used to determine trends for wilderness and semi-primitive areas.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
3d		<p>In reference to the proposed Monitoring Question: <i>"To what extent is forest plan implementation contributing or responding to the species of conservation concern and moving toward desired habitat conditions for these species?"</i></p> <p>Comment - Ok if this is just a change in the name of the category (from "Regional Forester's Sensitive Species" to "species of conservation concern") with the same species still included. We are however concerned about this change if this question no longer refers to these relatively rare species because there is a great need to monitor habitat conditions for the species included in the "Regional Forester's Sensitive Species".</p>	<p>As outlined in the documentation accompanying the 30-day comment period, the Monitoring Question referenced by the commenter (now Question 30) replaces the original Monitoring Question 34 ("To what extent is forest plan implementation contributing or responding to the conservation of species of viability concern [such as Regional Forester's Sensitive Species] and moving toward desired habitat conditions for these species?"). At this time, the list of species of conservation concern (SCC) has not been developed by the Regional Forester.</p> <p>The Planning Rule (36 CFR 219.9(c)) defines a SCC as a species other than federally recognized threatened, endangered, proposed or candidate species, that is known to occur in the plan area for which the regional forester has determined that the best available scientific information indicates substantial concern about the species' capability to persist over the long-term in the plan area. Until Forest Service policy is updated, we will continue to analyze for Regional Forester's Sensitive Species. Incorporation of SCC will require the development of Forest Plan components (via formal Revision process) necessary to provide desired ecological conditions to maintain viable populations of SCC within the plan area, or contribute to maintaining a viable population of a SCC across its range where it is not within the Agency's authority (or beyond the inherent capability of the plan area to provide the ecological conditions to maintain a viable population of that species within the plan area.)</p>
3e		<p>In reference to the proposed deletion of Monitoring Question: <i>"What are the effects of OHVs on the physical and social environment?"</i> Comment - Do not delete: good question & none of the remaining questions address OHV effects.</p>	<p>See Comments 2 and 3a.</p>
3f		<p>In reference to the proposed deletion of Monitoring Question: <i>"To what extent are road and trail closures effective in prohibiting unauthorized motor vehicle use?"</i> Comment - Same: Do not delete.</p>	<p>See Comments 1o, 2 and 3a.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
3g		In reference to the proposed deletion of Monitoring Question: " <i>To what extent is Forest management contributing to the preservation, evaluation of, and education for heritage resources?</i> " Comment - Do not delete: This is the only question under Resource Area "Heritage"	The Monitoring Question referenced (originally reported as Question 16) will be addressed through Monitoring Question now designated as #15, which states "To what extent is the Forest meeting its Federal Indian trust responsibility, including but not limited to, meeting the requirements of the memorandum of understanding, consulting with tribes for Forest management, and actively seeking collaborative opportunities?"
3h		In reference to the proposed deletion of Monitoring Question: " <i>To what extent are OHVs producing impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitats?</i> " Comment - Do not delete: Good question & none of the remaining questions address this OHV effect.	See Comments 2 and 3a.
3i		In reference to the proposed deletion of Monitoring Question: " <i>To what extent are road and trail closures effective in prohibiting unauthorized motor vehicle use?</i> " Comment - Duplicate: Same as the second question in table 3.	Comment noted.
4a	Kathy Stupak-Thrall (e-mail)	In reference to proposed Monitoring Question " <i>What is the status of selected watershed conditions?</i> ", sub-question b, " <i>To what extent are we restoring aquatic habitat connectivity?</i> " Indicator: " <i>Number of stream miles reconnected.</i> " Comment - To destroy or damage aquatic habitat that has existed for nearly 80 to 100 years is not acceptable. To have destroyed that which Mother Nature had evolved into a ponding of water, is unacceptable. I refer specifically to the "culvert project" at the outlet of Crooked Lake in Gogebic County. After much damage to this area and the attention given it by Crooked Lake riparians and the local Lac Vieux Desert Tribe, Forest Service Aquatic re-mediator, Mr. Robert Guberneck, has been called to service and has identified the wrongdoing of the project and has given direction to redefine the area to save the large resource of Crooked Lake from further damage to the lakes fishery, flora, fauna, wild rice habitat, loon or eagle nesting, ect, ect. I look forward to the continued effort of all interested parties to the spring and summer work effort to this restoration project.	The purpose of the administrative change for the monitoring program is not to change the way the landscape is managed, it is to ensure that the monitoring program is consistent with the required monitoring elements outlined in the 2012 Planning Rule. Monitoring for selected watershed conditions was not included in the 2006 Forest Plan's Monitoring Program; it became a requirement as a result of the 2012 Planning Rule. Monitoring will track progress toward implementation of management practices to provide the desired conditions outlined in the Forest Plan's Goals 2, 3, 20, 21, and 23, and their associated objectives.
4b		Comment - The above comments also apply to Table 2; first item; "To what extent is forest plan implementation affecting streams, lakes, ponds, wetlands and their associated riparian ecosystems?"	See Comments 1m and 4a.

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
4c		<p>In reference to the proposed Monitoring Question "<i>What is the status of visitor use and visitor satisfaction ?</i>"</p> <p>Comment - The Forest Service web-site has given the perception that all of Sylvania Wilderness is non-motorized, this is not true. The Federal Court has recognized the language of Congress, protecting "Valid Existing Rights" as property rights that exist to the entire surface of Crooked lake; therefore, the visitor can expect to experience motorized activity anywhere on the surface of this lake. It is unacceptable to mislead the public to expect an experience different than that which truly exists and it exists as directed by a Court of Law (U S Western District Court of Michigan, Northern Division; File No. 2;96-CV-054). It is only right and just that the Forest Service should give true, clear information as to the expected experience when visiting Sylvania. If a visitor would like a non-motorized experience they should be directed to the 35 other lakes of Sylvania that are non-motorized.</p>	<p>Monitoring Question 16 ("<i>Is wilderness management contributing to improvement or preservation of wilderness character and values?</i>") will be used to monitor the conditions within the wilderness based on this question's Indicator "<i>Score from the wilderness stewardship performance plan, by wilderness area</i>".</p>
5a	Marion True (mail)	<p>In reference to the Indicator "Acres of suitable Kirtland's warbler habitat" for the proposed Monitoring Question "<i>To what extent is forest management contributing to the conservation of threatened and endangered species and moving toward desired habitat conditions and population trends for these species ?</i>" Comment (Question) - Until confirmed nesting occurs, best let Huron-Manistee NF handle this. Comment (Indicator) - Requires rather large acreage of suitable jack pine age class. Perhaps another "Bump Fire" is warranted.</p>	<p>The Monitoring Question will track progress toward implementation of management practices to provide the desired conditions specifically outlined in the Forest Plan for Goal 28 and their objectives to provide for Kirtland warbler habitat.</p>
5b		<p>In reference to the proposed Monitoring Question "<i>What is the status of visitor use and visitor satisfaction ?</i>" Comment - Try more signing to explain to public "why" an occurrence is before them.</p>	<p>The purpose of the administrative change for the monitoring program is not to change the way the landscape is managed, it is to ensure that the monitoring program is consistent with the required monitoring elements outlined in the 2012 Planning Rule. No actions for signing will be associated with this administrative change. The Monitoring Question will track progress toward implementation of management practices to provide the desired conditions outlined in the Forest Plan for Goal 9 and its objectives to provide for a variety of recreational experiences.</p>

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
5c		In reference to the proposed Monitoring Question "Is Forest Plan implementation resulting in impacts that may substantially and permanently impair the productivity of the land?" Comment - Set up "show me trips" so public can see exactly what you are talking about.	Comment noted.
5d		In reference to the proposed modification of Monitoring Question " <i>To what extent is forest plan implementation affecting streams, lakes, ponds and wetlands and their associated riparian ecosystems?</i> " Comment - Show me trips to show public your serious?! etc problem areas and why. You may discover riparian systems are more adversely affected by other public organizations county, twp, states & privates & commerical land. Your emphasis needs to be with working (carefully) with them in improving.	See Comments 1m and 4a. Comment noted.
5e		In reference to the proposed deletion of Monitoring Question " <i>To what extent is forest management maintaining or restoring condition that result from or emulate natural ecological patterns and processes such as fire, wind, flooding and insect and disease break?</i> " Comment - Primarily timber sales followign pricinple of harvest the weaker trees. Healthy stands may be your best and only defense against the unknown or concerns of Global warming!! Active timber sales (management) appears to be the Ottawa's best line of defense agains the unknowns of Global warming. Favor vigrousand healthy trees over the weak, diseased, low quality trees->heal these stands. Guides have been around for decades. Regeneration - plantations, etc. Also a ++ to the economic and social needs of the northwoods area.	Comment noted.
5f		In reference to the proposed deletion of Monitoring Question " <i>To what extent is forest management utilizing the Ecological Classification System and its components to implement ecosystem based management?</i> " Comment - Keep it simple!!	Comment noted.
5g		In reference to the proposed deletion of Monitoring Question " <i>To How is forest plan implementation affecting soil quality (by management system)?</i> " Comment - Show me trips	Comment noted.

Appendix 1 - Input Raised During the 30-Day Comment Period

Comment ID	Commenter	Comments/Questions Raised	How Updated Monitoring Program Resolves Comments/Questions
5h		In reference to the proposed deletion of Monitoring Question " <i>To what extent is forest management providing ecological conditions to maintain viable populations of native and desired non-native species?</i> " Comment - Species cycle. Probably need more early successional habitats.	Comment noted.