

Colville NF Plan Revision

Follow-up List from County Commissioner Meetings September 2015

How Comments and Suggestions were Addressed in the Revised Forest Plan

During meetings with Ferry, Stevens, and Pend Oreille County Commissioners on September 10, 11 & 17 of 2015 the following items were determined to need further discussion and possible changes to the current version of the revised forest plan. The ID team discussed the comments and suggested changes and the following list displays how the requests were addressed or why they were not addressed.

Typos and grammatical errors identified by the commissioners have been addressed, but those individual items are not listed here.

<p>1-Request: Chapter 1 Introduction – add AUMs across allotments for the entire forest.</p> <p>Response: <i>Introduction pg. 3 – “Over the most recent 10-year period, the Forest has supported an average of 29,500 animal unit months of forage for cattle grazing.”</i></p>
<p>2-Request: Chapter 1 - <u>Ecosystem sustainability</u>: Add verbiage about balance between two competing things (lines 82-88).</p> <p>Response: <i>Introduction pg. 4 - this was reworded related to balance between county & Forest Service (FS) goals. “There is a need to find balance between demand for social and/or economic use and maintaining functioning aquatic and terrestrial resource habitats over the long-term.”</i></p>
<p>3-Request: Chapter 1 – <u>Timber production</u>: Add “historic” to timber harvest for clarification.</p> <p>Response: <i>Introduction pg. 4 – “historic” added for clarification.</i></p>
<p>4-Request: Chapter 1 – <u>Timber production</u>: add a clarifying statement to distinguish between mill generating jobs and the other ancillary part, to help paint the picture.</p> <p>Response: <i>Introduction, pg. 3 – added for clarification “Approximately 10% of the annual volume sold by the Forest is non-commercial material such as firewood or biomass.”</i></p>
<p>5-Request: Chapter 1 – <u>Timber production</u>: include timber offered for sale, but not sold.</p> <p>Response: <i>This information won’t be included in the draft plan. Volumes sold and harvested by fiscal year is available, but volume offered is not available in the FS records</i></p>
<p>6-Request: Chapter 1 – <u>Timber production</u>: be clear about the suitability and the reasoning behind choices made for land management allocations (how it ties to constraints).</p> <p>Response: <i>This is currently in the vegetation report, DEIS and project record. This may need wording change between draft & final.</i></p>
<p>7-Request: Chapter 1 – <u>Fire Management</u>: would like the plan to incorporate the benefits of fire</p> <p>Response: <i>Introduction, pg. 4 – additional information added</i></p>

8-Request: Chapter 1 – Overlapping management direction - consider changing the wording in the plan, to provide more clarity on what that actually means

Response: *Forest-Wide Direction – Introduction, pg. 23, MA Desired Conditions - added statement “Utilizing the most restrictive plan direction provides guidance and protection for resource-based or socially sensitive functions provided by National Forest system lands.”*

9-Request: Chapter 1 – Plan Structure (pg. 13) – include something about maps being a plan component. Should be stated that maps are part of the plan.

Response: *Plan Structure, pg. 14 – “maps” was added as part of the Plan Set of Documents*

10-Request: Chapter 1 – Roles & Contributions/International Level - Hydro power production section (pg. 19) - Grand Coulee is not a Columbia River treaty dam, make sure treaty language is accurate. Need clarification to make sure Grand Coulee is not part of the treaty

Response: *Roles & Contributions/International Level, pg. 19 – statement regarding the Columbia River Treaty removed from paragraph.*

11-Request: Chapter 1 – Roles & Contributions/State & Local Level - Diversity of wildlife species (pg. 21) – need reference for statement about “home to 65% of WAs white tailed deer population.”

Response: *Roles & Contributions/State & Local Level, pg. 21 – reworded for clarification “Northeast Washington harbors the largest White-tailed deer populations in Washington. White-tailed deer provide an important recreational, economic, ecological resource, contributing to local economies by attracting hunters to the area. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife identifies two areas that are managed for white-tailed deer that include portions of the Colville National Forest. The Okanogan Highlands is comprised of 25% national forest land and the Selkirks is 26% national forest land.”*

12-Request: Chapter 1 – Roles & Contributions/State & Local Level The state fish and wildlife plan states that elk are nonnative, that the state introduced.

Response: *Based on further review, statements in the draft plan are correct, since elk have historically occupied areas within northeast Washington. The following is wording from the 2014 Elk Plan.*

Archeological evidence indicates that elk were once widely distributed in eastern Washington. By the late 1800's year-round subsistence and commercial hunting eliminated Rocky Mountain elk in Washington, except for possibly some remnant animals in the Blue Mountains.

The Selkirk elk herd is primarily a reintroduced elk population, with reintroductions originating from Montana in 1915 and subsequent augmentations in 1932, 1969, 1970, and 2000. The Spokane Tribe of Indians and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation have also translocated elk to their respective reservations within the last 25 years. (B.J. Kieffer, Spokane Tribe of Indians, personal communication; S. Judd, Colville Confederated Tribes, personal communication). Several translocations in British Columbia have reestablished elk north of the international border. These combined efforts have contributed to a general range expansion of elk in northeastern Washington.

The elk population prior to the 1970's was primarily confined to northern Pend Oreille County. During the 1970's and 1980's elk expanded into northern Spokane and Stevens Counties. Beginning in the 1990's significant expansion of elk numbers and distribution took place within Ferry, Lincoln, Whitman, and southern Spokane Counties. (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2014. Selkirk Elk Herd Plan. Wildlife Program. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia. 59pp).

13-Request: Chapter 2 – Forest-wide direction (pg. 22) - confusion about forest-wide and what that means

Response: *Current wording: Forest-wide desired conditions apply only to National Forest System lands and are measured at a forest-wide scale unless otherwise stated.*

*This can be clarified in final revised plan to state desired conditions apply only to **Colville** National Forest system lands.*

14-Request: Chapter 2 – Forest-wide direction (Bottom of section, design criteria) – confusion about overlapping direction.

Response: *Forest-Wide Direction – Introduction, pg. 23, MA Desired Conditions - added statement "Utilizing the most restrictive plan direction provides guidance and protection for resource-based or socially sensitive functions provided by National Forest system lands."*

15-Request: Chapter 2 – Air Section Introduction (pg. 26) - protect from adverse effects of air pollution, how? What does it mean?

Response: *Air introduction, pg. 26 – added the following for clarification "The U.S. Forest Service is responsible for protecting national forests and surrounding areas from the adverse effects of air pollution that are sourced from Forest Service land. This is predominantly accomplished by working with Washington State Department of Natural Resources Smoke Management to plan prescribed burning when weather conditions would prevent smoke impacts from exceeding established air quality standards."*

<p>16-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Air Section</u> - How do you protect the forest from our (county) nonattainment status?</p> <p>Response: <i>Air introduction, pg. 26 - same as previous request.</i></p>
<p>17-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Air Section</u> - Need to include Tri County Health in public notifications of prescribed burning. Include that as a standard practice in burn plans.</p> <p>Response: <i>This is not addressed at the Forest Plan level. This ties to project-specific operational activities, not specific to what is listed in the Forest Plan. District and forest fuels specialists are now submitting email notifications of burn plans to Matt Schanz, Environmental Coordinator – Tri County Health, mschanz@netchd.org, 509-684-2262</i></p>
<p>18-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Vegetation</u> introduction, Vegetation within WUI section - there is a footnote #3 for (NWCC 2012) - is missing and needs to be added.</p> <p>Response: <i>Vegetation introduction, Vegetation within WUI section, pg. 31 - footnote added “National Wildfire Coordinating Group.”</i></p>
<p>19-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Vegetation</u> FW-GDL-VEG-01 – some confusion about the 100-ft vs 50-ft buffers, doesn’t make sense.</p> <p>Response: <i>FW-GDL-VEG-01. Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Plant Species – Disturbance in Occupied Habitat, pg. 38 – after follow-up with Forest Botanist, changed all buffers to 100-foot.</i></p>
<p>20-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Vegetation</u> FW-DC-VEG-02 - wording seems off - May need to define what the characteristic role is, provide more clarity to language</p> <p>Response: <i>FW-DC-VEG-02. Insects and Diseases, pg. 32 – reworded for clarity, changed “characteristic” to “natural (endemic)” role.</i></p>
<p>21-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Vegetation</u> FW-DC-VEG-03. Human Disturbance – in last sentence consider acknowledging DCs may sometimes be impaired but will mitigate.</p> <p>Response: <i>Not changed. IDT needs to discuss this since the desired condition may not be the place for this. Discussion of effects would be in the EIS. IDT will look at this between draft & final documents.</i></p>
<p>22-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Vegetation</u> FW-DC-VEG-03. Human Disturbance - if fire can move us to the DCs it can play a role. Need more clarity here.</p> <p>Response: <i>Unclear exactly what the Commissioners were looking for. The referenced desired condition currently includes wildland fire use as one of the human activities.</i></p>
<p>23-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Vegetation</u> FW-STD-VEG-04. Timber Production - make it clear what the components are, need to clarify and define this better for general public. What are suitable lands vs other areas.</p> <p>Response: <i>Suitability is defined in the glossary (EIS page 765)</i></p>
<p>24-Request: Need clarity on what regulated timber harvest is.</p> <p>Response: <i>FW-STD-VEG-04. Timber Production, pg. 37 - footnote added with definition “Regulated timber harvest means scheduled, periodic commercial harvests.”</i></p>

25-Request: Chapter 2 – Vegetation FW-STD-VEG-09. Harvest Systems – need some clarity here, sounds like there is nothing on the forest that is not feasible to log

Response: *Not changed. This is standard wording from regulation. Suitability is defined in the glossary (EIS page 765). How suitability is determined is in the vegetation specialist report.*

26-Request: Chapter 2 – Vegetation FW-OBJ-RFP-01. Planned Sale Quantity – commissioners would like the LTSY added to this

Response: *The discussion related to long-term sustained yield (LTSY) is located in chapter 3 of the DEIS and in the vegetation specialist report. LTSY assumes that lands suitable for timber production are in the desired future condition. We would not be meeting the 1982 rule for a non-declining flow of timber if we harvested at the LTSY level, since the forest is not within the desired condition yet. This objective does not prohibit the forest from offering timber volume greater than the number listed in this objective.*

27-Request: Chapter 2 – Water Resources - Water quantity. Discussed a canopy density study and having a DC to meet a target (60%) for canopy density. Desire a water quantity DC in the revised plan.

Response: *Kate Day, revision team hydrologist, met with Commissioner McCart on 10/6/2015.*

- *Kate will work on language to better integrate water quantity into specific forest plan components—working with the RO and IDT on this—potentially a desired condition for canopy cover for final EIS and plan.*
- *Kate received spatial aquifer data from Stevens County. She will include an analysis of aquifers overlain with management areas in the hydro analysis for the FEIS.*
- *Mr. McCart will continue to search for Colville-specific reference which gives a canopy cover % (60%) to maximize water yield.*
- *Mr. McCart will look at how the Colville River Water Resource Management Board plans addresses potential limiting factors to water quantity*

28-Request: Chapter 2 – Water Resources - FW-DC-WR-12 – concern that desired conditions are not just for fish

Response: *FW-DC-WR-12. Aquatic Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species, pg. 46 – added “and/or” other key life history requirements, for clarity.*

29-Request: Chapter 2 – Water Resources - FW-OBJ-WR-02. Aquatic Invasive and Non-Native Species. This is in regards to aquatic weeds, all of which are unacceptable

Response: *This needs additional work to determine if there is better way to focus the objective for treatment of aquatic invasive species. This wording does not preclude doing more than what is listed.*

<p>30-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Water Resources</u> - FW-OBJ-WR-03 – concern about wording here. For clarification, consider adding trails, maybe move livestock into a different sentence, change illegal to unauthorized</p> <p>Response: FW-OBJ-WR-03. <i>General Watershed Function and Restoration, pg. 48 – added “trails” to statement and changed “illegal” to “unauthorized” off-highway vehicle use.</i></p>
<p>31-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Water Resources</u> - FW-OBJ-WR-07 – discussion of 250 acres in regards to streams is confusing, add clarification since streams are linear</p> <p>Response: FW-OBJ-WR-07. <i>Key Watershed Range Infrastructure Improvements, pg. 48 - changed to “over 250 acres” for clarification.</i></p>
<p>32-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Wildlife</u> - FW-DC-WL-13 – calculates the zone of influence of human activities</p> <p>Response: FW-DC-WL-13. <i>Deer and Elk Habitat—Human Activities, pg. 54 – reworded for clarity “Winter ranges for deer and elk provide a high level of habitat effectiveness by having less than 30 percent of the winter range within a zone of influence of an open road or motorized travel route. Summer ranges provide a moderate level of habitat effectiveness by having less than 50 percent of the summer range within a zone of influence of an open road or motorized trail.”</i></p>
<p>33-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Wildlife</u> - FW-GDL-WL-07 (pg. 57) – regarding expansion of recreation and administrative facilities (campgrounds, trailheads) – wording needs some clarification</p> <p>Response: FW-GDL-WL-07. <i>Canada Lynx—Recreation and Administrative Facilities within Identified Lynx Habitat, pg. 58 – for clarity, added “Expansion or new construction of recreation facilities and administrative facilities...”</i></p>
<p>34-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Wildlife</u> - FW-GDL-WL-14 (pg. 58) – references DCs in Veg section, add table number here (table 5, pg. 32)</p> <p>Response: FW-GDL-WL-15. <i>Fire-Dependent Surrogate Wildlife Species, pg. 59 – added “Table 5” for reference.</i></p>
<p>35-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Access System</u> – statement was made that there are roughly 3 mi/mile² on average currently on the forest. (per phone call between Commissioner McCart & Amy Dillon [9/29/15]: Commissioners remember hearing a different number during meeting. Please double-check with Kate as to correct number that should be here.)</p> <p>Response: <i>Average road density across the forest is 2.5-3 miles of NFS road/square mile of NFS lands</i></p>
<p>36-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Access System</u> - FW-DC-AS-01 – desired conditions for the access system – will look at beefing up the safety aspect.</p> <p>Response: <i>Not changed. Safety is already part of Forest Service policy, so we are trying not to repeat existing direction in the plan.</i></p>

<p>37-Request: Chapter 3 – <u>National Scenic Trails</u> - There may be a holdover in the revised plan from the Pacific Crest Trail when we were still combined with the Okanogan-Wenatchee. If so, we could move mineral entry to the “may authorize” section in the table.</p> <p>Response: <i>Per Becky Blanchard (RO PNT PMF), the PNT corridor has not been withdrawn from mineral entry. When the plan is signed the corridor should be shown as “May” be Suitable for mineral leasable, locatable, and surface occupancy. This means that in the FEIS/final plan, the trail corridor will show the three mineral suitability rows as “may authorize”.</i></p>
<p>38-Request: Chapter 3 – <u>Backcountry & Backcountry Motorized</u> - The backcountry feeling is semi primitive – so may be able to highlight the DC in terms of what one can expect, maybe the signing piece</p> <p>Response: <i>Amy missed getting this clarification into the version that went out for public comment. Additional wording will be added to the final revised plan.</i></p>
<p>39-Request: Chapter 3 – <u>Backcountry & Backcountry Motorized</u> - beef up the backcountry motorized DC, even though the rest is in there, just need to drill down through the plan to find all the places</p> <p>Response: <i>Amy missed getting this clarification into the version that went out for public comment. Additional wording will be added to the final revised plan.</i></p>
<p>40-Request: Chapter 3 – <u>Backcountry & Backcountry Motorized</u> - Will try to make this clearer in the plan, do a better job of distinguishing between BC & BCM so it is less confusing.</p> <p>Response: <i>Amy missed getting this clarification into the version that went out for public comment. Additional wording will be added to the final revised plan.</i></p>
<p>41-Request: Chapter 3 – <u>Riparian Management Area</u> - MA-DC-RMA-01 – update wording from natural to functional. A riparian ecosystem that is functional.</p> <p>Response: <i>MA-DC-RMA-01. Composition, pg. 94 – changed wording to “Riparian management areas consist of native flora and fauna in a functional system and a distribution of physical, chemical, and biological conditions appropriate to natural disturbance regimes affecting the area.”</i></p>
<p>42-Request: Chapter 3 – <u>Riparian Management Area</u> - MA-STD-RMA-01 – in footnote 6 – consider water quantity in this issue, maybe not here but ties to properly functioning condition</p> <p>Response: <i>This is now footnote 8. Water quantity addressed in response to request #21, 22, 23, and 24.</i></p>
<p>43-Request: Chapter 3 – <u>Riparian Management Area</u> - MA-STD-RMA-09 - need to allow for point crossings for watering facilities to harmonize those, seems to be in conflict with this standard</p> <p>Response: <i>Not changed. Plan revision team could not find a way to reword this standard to include specific wording for point crossings and still maintain original intent. Rewording of these standards beyond their original intent needs to be coordinated with the Regional Office.</i></p>

44-Request: Chapter 3 – Riparian Management Area - Wildland Fire - Pg. 97 RMA standards - consider adding fire access and future suppression needs for human health and safety

Response: MA-STD-RMA-12 and MA-STD-RMA-13, pg. 96 – Not changed. Plan revision team could not find a way to reword this standard to include specific wording for point crossings and still maintain original intent. Rewording of these standards beyond their original intent needs to be coordinated with the Regional Office.

45-Request: Chapter 3 – Riparian Management Area - MA-GDL-RMA-09. Permitted Grazing Management - Greenline Vegetation Areas The commissioners would feel better if there was no stubble height number in the plan

Response: MA-GDL-RMA-09. Permitted Grazing Management - Greenline Vegetation Areas, pg. 98 – not fully addressed at this time since this is based on region-forest discussions. We expect to update grazing plan components between draft and final based on coordination with FS regional office. However, footnote #10 was added to explain the site-specific analysis tied to this guideline.

46-Request: Chapter 3 – Riparian Management Area - MA-GDL-RMA-19 – confusion as to when water bar/sediment control work on fire lines would occur –during or after a fire? Need to add clarifying language

Response: MA-GDL-RMA-19. Wildland Fire and Fuels Management - Fire Line Construction, pg. 100 – added “Water bars **on** fire lines...” for clarification.

47-Request: Chapter 3 – Riparian Management Area - MA-GDL-RMA-20 – add ‘non-emergency’ for wildfire (related to state hydraulic project approval).

Response: Not changed. This change was missed before publishing the draft revised plan. Will be reworded for final revised plan.

48-Request: Chapter 3 – Recommended Wilderness – Would there be any options to protect the watershed if there was a massive insect infestation, whether it was roadless or wilderness? Would any management activity occur?

Response: Direction related to this concern/question is located in the Forest Service Manual. Any treatment in wilderness would need to be designed to preserve the wilderness character and would be approved at the RO/WO level. The use of pheromones (like verbenone for mtn. pine beetle) is one potential option.

For an IRA, the same process we used during the fires this summer could be used to request permission to implement treatment in an IRA to help protect a watershed. We wouldn't have to worry about wilderness character, but we do have the no new roads and no commercial timber removal components of the 2001 Roadless Rule. Again, an RO/WO decision.

For recommended wilderness (that does not overlay an IRA) the decision can be made at the Forest/RO level. The forest plan would require us to protect the wilderness characteristics of the recommended wilderness, so the management options would be limited to those that might be acceptable in designated wilderness. There would also be the option to amend the forest plan and change the recommended wilderness boundary prior to it being designated as wilderness by Congress. This would allow other management options in the portions of the recommended wilderness that was not in an IRA.

<p>49-Request: Plan Appendices – <u>Draft Plan Appendix B</u> – Table on pages 4 and 5 – salvage is not checked, need to add explanation of why table is there</p> <p>Response: <i>Table B-2 – Modelled Vegetation Treatments by Management Area and Vegetation Type, pg. 5 – added explanation before the table “shows what treatments were proposed and included by management area for modelling vegetation changes related to the revised land management plan.”</i></p>
<p>50-Request: Plan Appendices – <u>Draft Plan Appendix B</u> – Request to add local government coordination to Appendix B.</p> <p>Response: <i>Appendix B Social and Economic Systems, pg. 9 – added bullet “Coordinate management plans and activities with state, local, and Tribal governments.”</i></p>
<p>51-Request: Plan Appendices – <u>Draft Plan Appendix B</u> – Hydrologic function – ground water in that category, hard to quantify.</p> <p>Response: <i>Appendix B Aquatic and Riparian Ecosystems, pg. 6 – added “ground and surface” hydrologic function.</i></p>
<p>52-Request: Plan Appendices – <u>Appendix E Scenic Integrity Objectives</u> – the map is small and needs explanation.</p> <p>Response: <i>Appendix D Scenic Integrity Objectives, pg. 1-3 – narrative added, and table D-1 Scenic Integrity Objective Definitions added.</i></p>
<p>53-Request: Other – <u>Special Interest Area (SIA)</u>: change the recommended wilderness on the Kettle Crest in Alternative P to a special interest area.</p> <p>Response: <i>Revised Forest Plan and DEIS Alternative P – now includes the 82,800 acre Kettle Crest Recreation Special Interest Area.</i></p>
<p>54-Request: Other – <u>Wilderness Recommended</u>: the commissioners would like more detail/clarification on how designation as wilderness could affect management of cattle allotments</p> <p>Response: <i>Direction related to permitted grazing in designated wilderness is located in the 1964 Wilderness Act and Congressional nationwide guidelines and specific statements of legislative policy. There are a couple of areas where there could be a change in the current management of cattle allotments. The first is that access for minor salt placement, fence repairs or checking on fence lines or other range improvements would likely change from motorized (if that is how they are currently done) to non-motorized. Second, while maintenance of range improvements is permissible, motorized equipment for maintenance activities would only be allowed where practical alternatives do not exist. This statement could affect the use of chainsaws to clear fences since the only examples given in the Guidelines are for backhoes, trucks and specialized equipment. Finally, new improvements would be limited to those needed for resource protection and not to accommodate increased numbers of stock.</i></p>

<p>55-Request: Other – Emergency Situations are outside the realm of the plan. Add a simple disclaimer in the plan to address that, address up front</p> <p>Response: <i>Not changed. Any wording added related to emergency situations needs to be consistent with regional and national direction.</i></p>
<p>56-Request: Other – Anywhere “managing human activities” is mentioned in the plan is a red flag for Commissioner McCart. Consider rewording the locations where this terminology shows up.</p> <p>Response: <i>Chapter 2, Forestwide direction, Wildlife Habitats, Surrogate species, pg. 51 - removed “primarily managing human activities”; FW-DC-WL-13. Deer and Elk Habitat—Human Activities, pg. 54 – removed “human activities” from narrative.</i></p>
<p>57-Request: Other – Commissioner Blankenship discussed the 2006 Ferry County Travel Management Plan given to the FS and would like to see it recognized in the new plan.</p> <p>Response: <i>Documents were received by Eric McQuay and are included in the project record.</i></p>
<p>58-Request: Other – Send the glossary to Polly Coleman (Stevens County Clerk of the Board) for distribution.</p> <p>Response: <i>Terms discussed during meetings with County Commissioners in September were added to the Glossary. Amy Dillon emailed the Glossary to Polly Coleman on 9/12/2015 for distribution to the commissioners.</i></p>
<p>59-Request: Other – Amy will send the comprehensive evaluation report (CER) to all commissioners</p> <p>Response: <i>Amy Dillon emailed the Draft Analysis of the Management Situation document to the three county commissioners on 10/8/2015.</i></p>
<p>The following responses to soil comments/questions (#60-66) are summary of discussion held Oct. 23, 2015, between Jason Jimenez and Commissioner McCart.</p>
<p>60-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Soil Section</u> – want to see the directions detailed or referenced for coverage of soil recovery/restoration post-fire and other issues with soil standards and productivity.</p> <p>Response: <i>This is not addressed at the Forest Plan level. These issues are dealt with through BAER (burned area emergency response), Regional, and Washington Office Direction.</i></p>
<p>61-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Soil Section</u> Discussed the inclusion of water quantity evaluations and determinations of managing the landscape for water quantity</p> <p>Response: <i>the science was not clear with regards to land management and water quantity. It is very difficult, time expansive, and the models are not very good for those determinations. The Forest Plan directs for restoration of landscapes and that management makes sense moving forward.</i></p>
<p>62-Request: Chapter 2 – <u>Soil Section</u> - The commissioner had several description and reference issues with the soil document, due to writers being soil scientist and not being completely detailed, he said he would forward those issues to Amy.</p> <p>Response: <i>These questions/comments are listed as request #21, 22, 23, and 24</i></p>

63-Request: Chapter 2 – Soil Section Page 27, table 1: in the section addressing water absorption & storage, clarify that the indicator references ‘volcanic’ ash cap so there is no misunderstanding that this relates to ash resulting from prescribed fire or wildfire

Response: *FW-DC-SOIL-01. Soil Productivity and Function, Table 1 pg. 27 – added “Volcanic” Ash Cap.*

64-Request: Chapter 2 – Soil Section Page 28, table 1: in the section addressing nutrient availability, clarify that the desired condition for “normal range of characteristics for the site” is based on the information found in the County soil surveys.

Response: *FW-DC-SOIL-01. Soil Productivity and Function, Table 1 pg. 28 – footnote added “Soil characteristics are defined by Natural Resources Conservation Service SSUGRO (Soil Survey Geographic Database) soil data layer.”*

65-Request: Chapter 2 – Soil Section Page 29, FW-GDL-SOIL-01. Total Soil Resource Commitment - There is maximum level of 5% of the forest listed in this guideline. Where are we now?

Response: *This number has not been determined yet. Should have answer by end of May.*

66-Request: Chapter 2 – Soil Section (general) – per discussion with Jason Jimenez, Commissioner McCart understands that a lot of the direction in the draft plan is based on Forest Service regional standards. He would like them referenced and included in the information available to the public so they can be used in conjunction with the draft plan for providing input/ comment.

Response: *A copy of the Region 6 Soil Quality Standards and Guidelines is included in the project record as an appendix to the soil report.*