

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
Letter 1		Danny Smith, Graham County Board of Supervisors
1	Yes please move forward with the 4FRI project. Please start now and please implement the project to the largest degree possible. Unquestionably, like every subsequent year, we will lose more forest within the area this fire season before August 8 th as “comments” are collected.	
2	The largest measurable environmental impact on the area will be catastrophic fire. This project gives Arizona forests and the nation a tremendous opportunity to demonstrate positive outcomes as a result of the thinning and rehab activities in the project. For recreation, water, and wildlife sake please put Arizonans to work saving our forests for future generations. Let’s do it!	
Letter 2		Rob Nelson, AZ DOT Northcentral District
1	ADOT’s Northcentral District is in support of the proposed project as it provides for a healthier forest, greater vegetation diversity, greater wildlife habitat, and decreased risk of high intensity crown fires.	
2	Additionally, we would like USFS to consider coordination with ADOT to perform these activities within ADOT right-of-way (ROW). ADOT is open to working with USFS to address the removal of trees with the recovery zone and thinning of trees within ADOT ROW. Adding these elements to the proposed action would benefit winter storm management practices, potential hazard trees within ADOT ROW, and sight distances being improved for motorists to react to concealed wildlife that can impair driver safety.	
3	Please be aware of ADOT’s requirements for an encroachment permit for any potential activities within the ADOT Right of Way (tree cutting, fencing modification and access control). ADOT’s contact for encroachment permits is listed below.	
4	Please notify our local ADOT representatives when burning activities (smoke) could potentially impact motorist safety. ADOT will need to install proper signage and message boards to inform the traveling public of potential activity impacts.	
5	Sediment (mud), vegetation or debris causing track-out from vehicles onto ADOT roadways, namely SR 260 and SR 87 for these proposed actions, must be mitigated using Best Management Practices (BMP5) (track-out pads, washing, etc.). For your convenience, attached to this comment letter is ADOT’s stabilized construction entrance specifications/design sheet.	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
6	Actively limit the amount of obliteration of existing ground cover vegetation to limit erosion.	
7	If erosion potential is increased due to the project, install additional control measures to control sediment in storm water runoff (straw wattles, hydro seeding, check dams, etc.)	
8	Minimize the potential spread of noxious weeds onto the ADDT Right of Way. Incorporate proper BMP's (controlling weeds near roadways, cleaning vehicles, etc.) when conducting these activities.	
Letter 3		Bill Davis
1	Be prepared to "adaptively manage" this operation. Make allowances for learning to improve actions. We do not know everything and the actions we take may or may not work. Be flexible.	
2	Additional roads together with the many existing roads and trails, increases the opportunity for access to the project area for off-road vehicles after completion of treatments and the mitigation measures have been employed. Although you have indicated several mitigation measures proposed for roads and trails in the area, these can be quickly negated if sufficient enforcement measures are not used. This could lead to the very problems your mitigation measures are intended to prevent, e.g., erosion of soils and deposition, wildlife habitat disturbances, etc.	
3	Treatments vary in their impacts to streams. How are stream values incorporated into decisions to go with various treatment methods? How do you propose to prioritize MSO PAC treatment methods with those needed to protect streams?	
4	What does it mean to "restore" 350 miles of stream "habitat?" Vegetation clearing will result in more warming of waters in Arizona even with maintenance of riparian corridors. How can you clear and thin vegetation while maintaining stream water temperatures?	
5	You mentioned the use of antelope as an indicator species and this works for terrestrial habitats; however, you need indicator species for aquatic habitats as well. We suggest use of EPT organisms as indicators of impacts of your actions on stream health but don't see this as an integral part of the project. Monitoring their presence before, during and after the treatments will provide vital data for adaptively managing the treatments.	
6	Timing of tree removals and prescribed burns no doubt will overlap critical nesting periods for MSOs. It would seem that winter activities when sufficient snow is available may be the best time to conduct such operations as this would avoid their nesting period and reduce erosion potential.	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	Obviously, monitoring of nest sites before, during and after operations is a critical action.	
7	The intensity of prescribed burns must be a consideration. Too many ground fires over small areas may result in excessive ash that could be washed into the reservoir. We assume the prescribed ground fires will be spaced out, spatially and temporally, to avoid this potential problem.	
8	Although much of the area is relatively flat, there are many small channels and valleys that conduct fair volumes of water during precipitation events. Logging activities that result in yarding on the fall line into these valleys could exacerbate erosion of soils despite your efforts to mitigate this with seeding, mulching, etc. Even slight deviations from the fall line may help prevent many erosion issues.	
9	Also, these trails can, and probably will, be used by off-road vehicles after the project is completed, unless maximum effort is made to discourage and prevent it.	
10	The inventory of species in the project area needs to be examined closely for potential <i>TIE</i> listings or other sensitive species. Using mitigation measures that can help a group of species associated with similar habitats may be a prudent approach and one that could prevent more stringent measures being required later on.	
11	The speed at which this project can be conducted is critically important to all of us. It is necessary to involve many in conducting this project but this should not result in stagnation due to an increasing bureaucracy. Please keep your eyes on the goal and not let the need to collaborate, mediate and compromise deny all of us the urgently needed protection this project will provide.	
12	Actions on the 4FRI should be collaborated with local communities. Your actions may be compromised if similar efforts are not employed within local communities with forest thinning issues. Not sure how this gets accomplished but in should be considered a necessary part of the entire effort.	
Letter 4		Aaron Green, District Manager, Northern District Arizona Dept. of Forestry and Fire Mgmt.
1	The State of Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management is writing to comment on the 4FRI Rim Country Proposed Action. Overall, we are proud to contribute as a partner, collaborator and stakeholder in the 4FRI	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	process and feel that the Proposed Action is a solid, well developed document.	
2	<p>We have two concerns regarding issues that were not addressed in the Proposed Action: biomass utilization and disposal and the utilization and disposal of the Pinon and Juniper. Both of these issues are opportunities and obstacles, but should be considered in all phases of the 4FRI projects. We do not feel that either of these issues are insurmountable to successful implementation, but would like to see a wide range of options for utilization and disposal addressed in the alternatives in the Environmental Impact Statement. These issues will have a direct impact on the project's success and economical feasibility.</p> <p>We recognize that economically viable biomass utilization, in the quantity addressed in the Proposed Action, is a challenging issue that affects engaging and attracting industry to Arizona and this project. We strongly support the 4FRI goal of an engaged industry being able to cover all or nearly all of the costs of removal of forest restoration byproducts by the use and sale of the products removed. There are serious concerns that if complete biomass removal is mandatory, the burden on the Forest Products Industry will be too great to overcome. We would like to recommend a wide range of options be considered in the alternatives that relates to the issue of biomass that would allow for biomass removal where economically feasible but would also allow other options to dispose of uneconomically feasible biomass.</p>	
3	We are similarly concerned about the economic viability of the more than 111,000 acres of Juniper and Pinon Juniper woodlands identified within the Rim Country project area. We are in favor of the goals and desired future conditions of the grassland and meadow restoration identified in the Proposed Action. We recognize the need to mechanically treat in these cover types to achieve the restoration goals, but have concerns about the lack of existing markets and the low value of the material generated by treatments being able to overcome the expense of mechanical treatments in these woodland cover types.	
4	Ultimately, we would like to see as many options available to limit constraints on the Forest Products Industry that might prevent, limit or delay the successful implantation of the 4FRI Rim Country Proposed Action. Thank you for your consideration of our comments and we look forward to continuing to work together to find economically viable solution to forest restoration and resiliency in Arizona.	
Letter 5		Joni Howard

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
1	We live in Deer Creek so this FRI doesn't really pertain to us but we are surrounded by Tonto National Forest lands so I wanted to get my thoughts into your committee. I think it's great and is really needed especially the thinning. Our forests are too overgrown with grasses, brush, bushes and trees growing so close together. I have seen the old pictures of the forests on the rim from 100 years ago and you can tell that Mother Nature did an excellent job keeping the forest thinned. Good luck to you all fighting environmentalists and those that don't get it.	
Letter 6		Jim Strogon
1	Take advantage of opportunities that present themselves like: Dead oak brush under tall canopy along the road to Tonto Hatchery just after you turn off from 260. It would seem a perfect time to do a burn to clean out that understory that's already dead	
2	Be aware of conditions like: the grass under the powerlines on the road up to the Tonto hatchery. High grass under big hill that with a careless cigarette could impact power and get into forest quickly.	
3	Be sensitive to impacts on streams. Treat areas with native trout or areas that historically supported native trout with the same degree of concern, respect as the Mexican spotted owl and the norther goshawk.	
4	Time and money it takes to get the forest back to a safer state.	
5	Priority to be given to protecting CC Cragin area and Payson's water source.	
Letter 7		4FRI Stakeholder Group
1	<p>In collaboration with the Forest Service, the Stakeholder Group has been an integral part of the 4FRI planning effort since 2009. Together we successfully developed in 2015 a robust Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision for the 1st 4FRI analysis area that is now being implemented as part of the largest forest restoration effort in the country. We look forward to duplicating this success with the Rim Country EIS in order to extend restoration treatments along the entire Mogollon Rim, over an area totaling in excess of 2 million acres.</p> <p>The comments expressed in this letter represent the views of the Stakeholder Group. The Stakeholder Group represents approximately 30 organizations and businesses, spanning a diversity of interests from conservation, industry, local government, academia, recreation and the public. We all stand to be directly impacted by the Rim Country Proposed Action.</p> <p>This letter has two purposes:</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To express strong support for the Rim Country Analysis; 2. To provide scoping comments regarding the Rim Country Proposed Action. 	
2	<p>I - Support for the Rim Country Project</p> <p>As amply documented by the conservation, academic and agency scientists, and as generally well supported by an overwhelming majority of stakeholders, the highly departed current conditions of the forested ecosystems in the Rim Country require action to re-establish forest structure, pattern and function, in order to increase forest resiliency and reduce the risk of uncharacteristic fire behavior.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group therefore strongly supports the objective of the Rim Country Analysis “to reestablish and restore forest structure and pattern, forest health, and vegetation composition and diversity in ponderosa pine ecosystems to conditions within the natural range of variation, thus moving the project area toward the desired conditions” (Rim Country Proposed Action).</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group further strongly supports the desired outcome of “improving structure and function (and) increas(ing) ecosystem resiliency (and) the ability of [the Rim Country] ecosystem to survive natural disturbances such as fire, insects and disease, and climate change without changing its inherent function” (Rim Country Proposed Action).</p> <p>Therefore, the Stakeholder Group strongly supports the Purposes and Needs stated for the Rim Country Project to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Increase forest resiliency and sustainability; • Reduce risk of undesirable fire effects; • Improve terrestrial and aquatic species habitat; • Improve the condition and function of streams and springs; • Restore woody riparian vegetation; • Preserve cultural resources; • Support sustainable forest products industries” (Rim Country Proposed Action). 	
3	<p>II - Comments on the Rim Country Proposed Action</p> <p>1) Good Starting Point Document</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group appreciates the overall quality and comprehensiveness of the Proposed Action, and passes on a resounding “Well Done!” to the people and the team responsible for it.</p>	
4	2) Need to Include All Stakeholders Input	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>The Stakeholder Group appreciates that much of the early stakeholder input has been integrated in the Proposed Action, as illustrated in the cross-walk document <i>How Feedback on Rim Country draft PA was Addressed</i>. However, the stakeholders noted a number of areas in which the Proposed Action could more fully incorporate comments provided on the Draft Proposed Action. These include issues and opportunities related to habitat restoration and management for terrestrial and aquatic wildlife.</p> <p>We request that all input from all stakeholders be considered and analyzed in the EIS, and that the Forest Service extend all possible opportunities to stakeholders to not only provide, but further discuss their input with the interdisciplinary team. In the spirit of collaboration, and to SHG scoping comments on Rim Country Proposed Action page 3 of 6 ensure transparency, when stakeholder input is not included, a disclosure and explanation of the decision should be shared with the Stakeholder Group.</p>	
5	<p>3) Need for Details</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group understands and appreciates that a Proposed Action, by its very nature, cannot be – and should not be - as detailed as an Action Alternative, or as an Impact Analysis.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that the extremely general short paragraphs that describe possible restoration actions, such as the paragraphs on Proposed Treatments (p. 21), Grassland and Meadow Restoration (p. 25), Spring Restoration (p. 26), Riparian Stream and Stream Channel Restoration (p. 26), Stream Habitat Restoration (p. 26), Aspen Restoration (p. 26), do not convey anything more substantial than generalities, and do not provide the public with a meaningful understanding of the number, intensity, distribution, timing or potential effects of the actions that are being proposed.</p> <p>From a different perspective, we observe that some new terms such as “No Fire” (e.g. Tables 3 & 4, p. 7) have appeared but are not specifically defined, and that the language addressing the long standing issue of old growth and future old growth shifts from the notion of “old trees” to “large trees” to “old and large trees.” Additional consistency and definition of terms used, is needed.</p> <p>We fully expect that the Rim Country EIS Action Alternatives and associated Effects Analyses will provide all needed details for each Action Alternative and Effects Analysis, and that these details will be made available to the Stakeholder</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Group in a timely manner, so that Stakeholders can conduct additional analysis and provide input to the Forest Service.</p> <p>We further request that the proposed management actions in old growth and future old growth (large young trees) stands be very explicit, and include the clear statement that no old growth trees (predating Euro-American settlement or currently exhibiting old growth structural characteristics) shall be cut. Regarding the Stands with Preponderance of Large Young Trees (SPLYT), we request that the unfinished work currently underway in the Planning Workgroup between the stakeholders and the Forest Service continue in order to jointly and collaboratively identify the most accurate descriptors and characterizers for the SPLYT, and the most appropriate treatments for these stands. This issue is very important to the Stakeholder Group.</p>	
6	<p>4) Need to Increase and Broaden the Wildlife Focus</p> <p>The Proposed Action would benefit from inclusion of a broader scope of wildlife habitat restoration needs and actions. Notably, the Proposed Action should address increasing wildlife diversity through increased spatial heterogeneity of habitat components for aquatic and terrestrial wildlife within the footprint, not just those that are federally protected.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group understands that the Cooperating Agency relationship between the Forest Service and the Arizona Game & Fish Department will be a conduit for addressing some of these concerns. However, input from other stakeholders should be fully incorporated at the scoping stage as well, as there is no certainty that the Forest Service will include such input later in the NEPA process. The Stakeholders request that their issues be included in the Proposed Action to ensure that they are analyzed in the NEPA process. SHG scoping comments on Rim Country Proposed Action page 4 of 6</p> <p>We therefore request that the wildlife focus be significantly increased and broadened, and that all interested stakeholders be given full opportunity to contribute to the development of restoration actions that relate to fish and wildlife.</p>	
7	<p>5) Need to Increase and Broaden the Attention to Socio-Economic Issues</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group appreciates the fact that the Forest Service modified its first draft of the Proposed Action to include a Statement of Socio-Economic Purposes & Needs, and an accompanying short narrative in response to the input of the Stakeholder Group.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>However, we are concerned that this narrative may indicate a worrisome bias when stating: “Engaging industry would offer the opportunity to cover all, or nearly all, of the cost of removal of forest restoration byproducts by the value of the products removed” (Rim Country Proposed Action). While in many cases this statement may be perfectly appropriate, there also exist many cases in which this statement may be leading to unrealistic expectations. Treatment types, biomass removal specifications, current conditions, desired conditions, and maybe above all, treatment locations and hauling distances, are all critical factors that contribute in making the value of the material removed sufficient, or not, and sometimes by far, to fully offset the costs of treatments.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group therefore requests that socio-economic current existing conditions and socio-economic desired conditions be added during the NEPA process to support the socio-economic statement of purposes and needs, and that detailed analyses of the economic viability of the treatments be conducted during the EIS process, treatment area by treatment area, to guide the Implementation Plan, and, ultimately, inform the selection of the contracting and packaging mechanisms of the treatments.</p>	
8	<p>6) Need for In-Depth Descriptions and Analyses of Proposed Treatments and Restoration Actions</p> <p>As previously noted in Section 3 <i>Need for Details</i>, the paragraph on Proposed Treatments (p. 21) is extremely general. Further, the <i>Mechanical Treatments</i> table (pp. 22 to 25) outlines a series of ranges of treatment descriptions and objectives (e.g.: Uneven-aged Group Selection in Ponderosa Pine: “thin stands to 20-80 square feet of basal area and establish interspaces over 10-90% of the stand;” Uneven-aged Group Selection in Dry Mixed Conifers: “thin tree groups to 30-100 square feet of basal area;” Intermediate Thin in Ponderosa Pine: “thin tree groups to 70-90 square feet of basal area;” Intermediate Thin in Dry Mixed Conifers: “thin tree groups to 40-100 square feet of basal area;” etc.) but there is no indication of any distribution of treatment intensities across the sites, creating the possibility, that ALL treatments could be implemented at the highest, or lowest, intensity of the ranges, while technically remaining within the specified ranges.</p> <p>Further, the treatment descriptions and objectives do not reference the Best Available Science Information (BASI) sources necessary to assess whether the treatments are likely to meet the objectives of the Proposed Action in the relevant stands, or how the direct or indirect effects of the treatments will impact the neighboring stands.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Finally, all the proposed mechanical treatments include the statement “and/or Prescribed Fire” (Table 9). We are concerned that many treatments need to include both mechanical thinning “and” prescribed fire. In many cases fire cannot be reintroduced before thinning first, and in most cases thinning should be followed by prescribed fire.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group therefore requests that the EIS include an in depth description and analysis of the proposed treatment and restoration actions, including the Best Available Science Information (BASI) supporting the design and selection of the treatments, the sequencing of mechanical and prescribed fire treatments, and the detailed analysis of the direct and indirect ecological impacts of the treatments in the Rim Country Analysis.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group further requests the thorough development of a range of Action Alternatives that addresses the effects of treatment types, treatment intensities, and the cumulative effects of implementation actions across the landscape.</p> <p>In addition, the Stakeholder Group requests that the development of Rim Country Action Alternatives, and their analyses, include additional restoration actions, such as but not limited to restoration of riparian and aquatic habitats, in all those areas and projects (e.g. Cragin Watershed Protection Project (CWPP)), that are located within the Rim Country EIS footprint, and that have been, or are going to be mechanically thinned for wildfire protection or fuels management purposes under separate NEPA analyses.</p>	
9	<p>7) Need to Integrate Monitoring and Adaptive Management Flexible Tools The Stakeholder Group is concerned that Monitoring and Adaptive Management are not explicitly addressed in the Proposed Action.</p> <p>This is an important issue for the Stakeholder Group. Our previous scoping comments for the first 4FRI Proposed Action are still relevant for this Proposed Action: “In addition to the need for a targeted and efficient monitoring program, we also would like to emphasize the tremendous opportunity provided by the 4FRI to increase our understanding of the ecology of these systems. Given the 4FRI’s commitment to being a science-based endeavor we would ask that the Forest Service help cultivate an atmosphere that is conducive to research being conducted by a variety of partners. Adaptive management requires explicit statement of goals and objectives, and a well-informed monitoring program that</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>has the requisite power to detect management impacts rapidly enough to inform future management. Furthermore, adaptive management is a structured decision-making process that relies on clearly articulated triggers for management change. Finally, adaptive management requires a commitment to change management when monitoring data indicates that the thresholds identified by those triggers have been crossed” (SHG Comments 1st 4FRI EIS).</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group requests that the Forest Service engage collaboratively with the 4FRI Stakeholder Group to develop a comprehensive Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan to be included in the Rim Country EIS and Record of Decision.</p>	
10	<p>The Stakeholder Group appreciates the efforts deployed by the Coconino, Tonto and Apache-Sitgreaves national forests and the USFS 4FRI staff and leadership to perform the thoroughly robust Environmental Impact Statement that the Rim Country Project deserves, and we urge the Forest Service Team to complete this task in the timeliest manner.</p> <p>We expect to be actively involved in the development of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Rim Country Project; we hereby reserve the right to provide further comments as the process unfolds; and, in the spirit of collaboration, we respectfully request that the Forest Service commit to receiving and considering further comments and emerging ideas provided under the auspices of continuous scoping as the Action Alternatives are developed and the Effects Analyses are conducted.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group is committed to working with the Forest Service to design, implement and monitor an ecologically, economically, legally and socially robust Environmental Impact Statement.</p>	
Letter 9		<p>Peter Steere Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Tohono O’odham Nation</p>
1	<p>On page 3 of the 4FRI Rim Country project – you indicate that one of the purposes of this project is to “preserve cultural resources.” And on page 5 you expand on this by stating that “there is a need to reduce threats to cultural resources by overly dense vegetation and soil erosion.” The primary threat here</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	to cultural resources high severity fires. By reducing fuel loads accumulation around cultural resources you would reduce threats to these cultural resources.	
2	Page 3 – could you please define “natural range of variation”	
3	The Tohono O’odham Nation’s Tribal Historic Preservation Office would support this effort to protect cultural sites.	
4	When fuel reduction activities start in the proximity of a cultural site there should be a forest archaeologist on site to mark and monitor any such activity.	
5	On page 9 you state “that there are 411 known springs in the Rim Country project area.” Many tribes regard springs as sacred sites. Any work in the vicinity of springs needs to be carefully monitored	
6	Page 10 – we assume that the major mechanical treatment is thinning, is this correct?	
7	Page 11 – one of the treatments is controlled fires – care should be taken when doing controlled burns in the vicinity of cultural sites – forest archaeologist should monitor	
8	Page 12 – can you explain how travel management rules (TMR) which may include improvement, removal or relocation – please expand discussion to explain what measures will be implemented to protect cultural sites in the event of road improvements, removal or relocation.	
9	Page 13 – please define “other restoration activities.”	
10	Page 14 – construction activities – 200 miles of protective barriers around springs, aspen, Bebb’s willows and big-tooth maples will need to be monitored – as stated earlier springs are regarded as sacred sites by many tribes.	
11	<p>Appendix A – Proposed Forest Plan Amendments</p> <p>Page 29 – no discussion of project impacts on cultural sites on the Coconino National Forest</p> <p>Page 30 – in discussion of cultural resources on the Tonto National Forest – please define when Programmatic Agreement (PA) you are referring to , You state that the Tonto National Forest has “ a standard that directs management to achieve a no “no effect” determination for cultural resources You then state “the Forest Service will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) and the Programmatic Agreement</p> <p>You then state that “ An amendment specific to the 4FRI Rim County EIS would remove the following “no effect” language: sites listed in, nominated to, eligible</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>for, or potentially eligible for the National Register will be managed during the conduct of undertakings to achieve a “No Effect” finding in consultation with State Historic Preservation Officer.”</p> <p>This paragraph is unclear – are you removing “no effect” management as regards cultural sites – this section need to be rewritten in clearer manner.</p>	
12	<p>In Summary</p> <p>I assume that on any area slated for mechanical treatment – a cultural resource survey would be completed, a report prepared and consultation letters will be sent to tribes with copies of cultural reports for review and comment.</p>	
Letter 10		Lynn Krigbaum
1	I have no expertise in this area. I am willing to be involved in monitoring as a citizen scientist.	
2	I wish you could speed up the process!	
3	I also wonder how the juniper trees can be removed	
Letter 11		Mark Perkins
1	<p>Hello, great to read about the 4 Forest Restoration Initiative. Appears that a great deal of good work is planned to improve our forest, ecosystem, streams, habitat for animals, etc. I've lived in Az most of my life and have spent considerable time in the forest (hiking, backpacking, fishing, etc) and have raised my children with sound outdoor ethics.</p> <p>One of my biggest concerns in the outdoors is the abuse by ATV's/OHV's. I see this everywhere, from deserts to the mountains. Lack of ethical riding, clear disregard for signage/closures, disregard for trails/roads that are meant/designated for hiking only, etc. Of course, it's only a small percentage of users who can't follow the rules. Aside from some of the road closures that I see, what other initiatives are planned to reduce some of the back country abuse by ATV/OHV users?</p>	
		Marsha Honn
1	Please consider this official public comment and input of Rim Country 4 FRI proposed plan. I want this to be part of your official public record. Thanks you	
2	The USFS Rim Country 4FRI project has shown no plans on how they can perform massive slash pile, prescribed burns, and “managed wildfires” and protect human health. There was no plan to protect human health or discussion of it in the USFS burn policies in the Coconino 4FRI plan. It appears that there	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	is no concern for the health of Arizona residents, including its own forest service workers.	
3	It has been documented that plant toxins (alkaloids) from smoldering fires may produce more toxins than wildfires. This should be a great reason to keep Arizona citizens exposure to these toxins at a minimum. Fine particulate matter from fuel combustion poses a danger to everyone, but is particularly hazardous to children and the elderly. Approximately 80 to 90 percent of wood smoke particles are 2.5 microns or smaller. EPA studies show that these tiny dagger-shaped particles are particularly harmful as they are able to go deep into the lungs. Other particles pass through the lungs into the blood stream and can attack vital organs. This may cause increased risk of dying to people who suffer diabetes, COPD, and heart disease.	
4	Smoke from wildfires and prescribed burns also contains volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide, ozone, numerous toxins and literally thousands of chemicals. One in particular is mercury. Studies show that mercury causes its greatest damage to unborn fetuses and newborns. This may include developmental defects, reduced IQ, mental retardation, learning disabilities, behavioral problems and chronic neurological diseases. Already, Arizona lakes such as Roosevelt, Tonto Creek, Soldier Lake, Scott Reservoir and Upper and Lower Lake Mary post mercury warnings that fish are not safe for consumption.	
5	Given the hazards from particulate matter and other substances released during prescribed burns, slash pile burning, or “managed” wildfires, alternatives to prescribed burns need to be sought and implemented by the Forest Service. These safer alternatives include logging for fire breaks, chipping, thinning, and goat or cattle grazing. The USFS will simply say that these methods are too costly, but they are simply shifting the cost to the general public in terms of health problems, pain and suffering. Implementation of these techniques will protect not only the health of the public, but provide cleaner air and reduced carbon emissions. Please consider not only the “health” of the forest, but HUMAN HEALTH.	
6	We have disabled family members who have almost died from the constant smoke you create. You probably don't give a hoot, but at great financial and personal sacrifice we have had to move away from family and friends and to another part of the state to escape your hideous and constant burning. You must have no conscious at all.	
Letter 12		Kathy Smith

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
1	Please include Greer in the Forest Restoration Project! So much of the area was destroyed by the Wallow Fire. Please don't allow the rest of Greer to be destroyed as well!	
Letter 13		Danny Smith, Graham County Board of Supervisors
1	<p>Yes please move forward with the 4FRI project. Please start now and please implement the project to the largest degree possible. Unquestionably, like every subsequent year, we will lose more forest within the area this fire season before August 8th as “comments” are collected.</p> <p>The largest measurable environmental impact on the area will be catastrophic fire. This project gives Arizona forests and the nation a tremendous opportunity to demonstrate positive outcomes as a result of the thinning and rehab activities in the project. For recreation, water, and wildlife sake please put Arizonans to work saving our forests for future generations. Let’s do it!</p>	
Letter 14		<p>Leigh J. Kuwanwisiwma Hopi Tribe</p> <p><i>Note the letter from the Hopi Tribe referenced past letters from the first EIS completed for the 4FRI project.</i></p>
1	<p>This letter is in response to your correspondence dated July 1, 2016, regarding the Four Forest Restoration Initiative and the enclosed 4FRI Rim Country Project Proposed Action. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to prehistoric cultural groups on the Coconino, Tonto, Apache-Sitgreaves and Kaibab National Forests. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of prehistoric archaeological sites and we consider the prehistoric archaeological sites of our ancestors to be "footprints" and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate the Forests' continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.</p> <p>The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office previously reviewed the <i>Four Forest Restoration Initiative-Heritage Resources Strategy and NEPA Compliance</i>, and the summary of up-coming and on-going Coconino National Forest cultural resource surveys and sample survey efforts in the 4FRI project area. Enclosed</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>are our letters regarding the Four Forest Initiative dated March 21 and June 6, 2011, April 9, 2013, December 21, 2015 and February 16, 2016.</p> <p>We understand the Rim Country Project proposal involves 1.24 million areas on the Apache Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto National Forests. Please note that our enclosed letters request continuing consultation with the Forests on the implementation and review of the cultural resources surveys, as well as Traditional Cultural Properties and ethnographic studies.</p>	
Letter 15		William Baker
1	<p>I suggest some modifications to the purpose and need:</p> <p>First, the document describes the purpose as to “restore forest structure and pattern...to conditions within the natural range of variation, thus moving the project area toward the desired conditions,” but then explains that the desired conditions are “in the land and resource management plans.” The document also says that research, science, and landscape restoration criteria in the Omnibus Public Land Management Act also went into developing the purpose and need. All of these seem fine except using the land and resource management plans to define desired conditions, since the plans do not have the same focus as this project. Instead, I suggest you use all these sources except the land and resource management plans, then amend the plans as needed after the EIS for this project is finalized. I think this could be the intention, since Appendix A lists proposed amendments. However, the “Desired Conditions” section does repeat the idea that the proposed treatments come from the land and resource management plans. I hope this is not true, and I suggest rephrasing the purpose and need to make it clear that the purpose and need does not come from desired conditions in the land and resource management plans.</p>	
2	<p>I support the bullet “increase forest resiliency and sustainability” but “sustainability” should be defined and limited to the forest ecosystem itself, to make it clear that we are not talking about sustaining products from the forest ecosystem, which are already in the last bullet. This can be accomplished by clarifying this bullet as “forest resiliency and forest ecosystem sustainability.”</p>	
3	<p>I do not support the bullet “reduce risk of undesirable fire effects.” That implies that people will define what is desirable to them, but that is not necessarily congruent with restoring “to conditions within the natural range of variation” and also is not congruent with the Omnibus Act, which uses the phrase “reestablishing natural fire regimes.” This can be resolved by changing the bullet to “Restore the natural fire regime.” I think this is needed, because much of the</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	funding comes from the Omnibus Act, and because restoring to conditions within the natural range of variability also means restoring the natural fire regime.	
4	I support the bullets about terrestrial and aquatic habitat, streams and springs, riparian vegetation, and cultural resources.	
5	I might support the bullet: “Support sustainable forest products industries” but the project generates products only for 10 years, so it is impossible for these industries to demonstrate sustainability beyond the 10-year period, and at the end of this period the resources that are available under this project also end. I suggest changing this bullet to read “Support forest products industries that use sustainable practices and have the potential to remain sustainable using other resources after the project period ends.”	
6	<p>The Proposed Action needs to revise the historical fire regime and forest structure. The document indicates “There is a need to restore the frequent low-severity fire regimes in which the forest in the Rim Country project area evolved” and later (p. 11): “Desired conditions are for no more than 15% of the ponderosa pine (under conditions modeled) in the treatment area to be prone to crown fire or high-severity fire, with areas of potential high severity spatially distributed.” The scientific basis for these numbers and this proposal of course are not provided in the document, but it is difficult to see how they can be supported by the available science.</p> <p>The draft EIS should comprehensively review and take a hard look at the available scientific evidence about historical fire regimes in the project area and in comparable areas nearby, including our publication. It documents that very substantial amounts of high-severity fire historically shaped both ponderosa pine and dry mixed-conifer forests inside the project area:</p> <p>Williams, M. A. and W. L. Baker. 2012. Spatially extensive reconstructions show variable - severity fire and heterogeneous structure in historical western United States dry forests. <i>Global Ecology and Biogeography</i> 21:1042-1052.</p> <p>Of course, it is appropriate to review the critique of this publication by Fulé et al. (2014), but if you do this, you should of course also review and report the specific rebuttals we made to their critiques in Williams and Baker (2014). Here are the two citations:</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Fulé, P. F., T. W. Swetnam, P. M. Brown, D. A. Falk, D. L. Peterson, C. D. Allen, G. H. Aplet, M. A. Battaglia, D. Binkley, C. Farris, R. E. Keane, E. Q. Margolis, H. Grissino-Mayer, C. Miller, C. H. Sieg, C. Skinner, S. L. Stephens, and A. Taylor. 2014.</p> <p>Unsupported inferences of 79 high severity fire in historical western United States dry forests: Response to Williams and Baker. <i>Global Ecology and Biogeography</i> 23:825-830.</p> <p>Williams, M. A. and W. L. Baker. 2014. High-severity fire corroborated in historical dry forests of the western United States: response to Fulé <i>et al.</i> <i>Global Ecology and Biogeography</i> 23:831-835.</p> <p>The description of the fire regime as “frequent low-severity” is not supported by the findings of Williams and Baker (2012), which is the only reconstruction of fire severity across a very large land area that includes much of the project area. Be careful with other available literature as there is very little tree-ring research on the historical fire regime in the project area that includes actual reconstruction of fire severity using forest age structure. Most tree-ring research assumed that fire severity was low in these forests and did not collect information to determine fire severity. That is not scientific evidence that the historical fire regime was “frequent low severity” as described in the Proposed Action.</p> <p>I hope that when you present the draft EIS you will have revised the historical fire regime description so it is “mixed severity” or “variable severity” and you will have accepted that this historical fire regime at times included substantial high-severity fire, so that the proposed goals of no more than 15% high severity in ponderosa and no more than 20% high severity fire in dry mixed conifer will not be used. Those numbers are too low relative to the evidence we presented (Williams and Baker 2012), and there is limited evidence about historical fire severity in other sources for the project area.</p>	
7	<p>Do not overpromise what can be accomplished regarding large, severe fires. It would be a significant matter to not reveal to the public the evidence in Williams and Baker (2012) and treat this evidence seriously, as it shows the historical fire regime to have been mixed-severity, not low severity. If you indicate in the draft EIS that you are going to restore a fire regime that included no more than 15% high-severity fire, and subsequent fires have much more high-severity fire than this, then you will have lost public faith in these large restoration programs. If,</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>instead, you indicate that you expect restoration to reduce fire severity somewhat, because fuels will have been reduced, but also make it clear that severe fires were part of the natural range of variability and could still occur, you will not be over-promising. I think it is also important to make it clear that fuels are only part of the fire equation and you cannot control the weather and climate parts of this equation. This, too, is an important part of not over-promising.</p> <p>Also, I do not know which model you used to estimate the reduction in fire severity expected from treatments. However, all the common models (e.g., FlamMap), have known errors that mean they significantly underpredict the probability of crown-fire initiation. Those errors have not been fixed. Here is the peer-reviewed scientific publication that shows this, and proposes using an alternative validated model that can be downloaded and used instead. These two authors are the world authorities on fire-behavior and fire modeling and are collaborating with USFS researchers on fire modeling:</p> <p>Cruz, M.G., Alexander, M.E., 2010. Assessing crown fire potential in coniferous forests of western North America: a critique of current approaches and recent simulation studies <i>International Journal of Wildland Fire</i> 19, 377-398.</p> <p>Use their model, CFIS, not the standard models used by USFS, and you will again avoid overpromising, in this case because of a documented modeling flaw, what can be accomplished via this restoration program. Here is a recent publication, that includes a USFS researcher, that mentions this flaw, then avoids it by using CFIS, and shows how to do it. I suspect Tinkham or Battaglia at the Rocky Mt. Res. Station and Martin Alexander in Canada would help with CFIS:</p> <p>Tinkham, W. T., C. M. Hoffman, S. A. Ex, M. A. Battaglia, and J. D. Saralecos. 2016. Ponderosa pine forest restoration treatment longevity: implications of regeneration on fire hazard. <i>Forests</i> 7, 137.</p> <p>This journal is online: http://www.mdpi.com/journal/forests</p>	
8	<p>Propose to take action to reduce human-set fires in the project area Please also review and present the evidence in Baker (2015), which shows that high-severity fires are not generally increasing across dry forests in most of the western USA, but are in the larger analysis area that includes the project area:</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Baker, W. L. 2015. Are high-severity fires burning at much higher rates recently than historically in dry-forest landscapes of the western United States? PLOS One 10(9), e0136147.</p> <p>This journal is also online: http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0136147. Please explain that, although there is an upward trend in ponderosa, high-severity fire is still operating within its historical range and has a recent fire rotation of 686 years in ponderosa and 592 years in dry mixed conifer. Those fire rotations are quite long and provide ample time for dryforests to fully regenerate and grow back to old-growth forests. Also, there is no upward trend in the fraction of fires that are burning at high severity.</p> <p>Please also explain that many of the large, severe fires that have contributed to the trend in ponderosa are human-set fires. There are quite a few things that the project could propose to help reduce the possibility of human-set fires. Certainly, reducing tree density and fuels will have some effect, but also you can take action to close access to certain areas during severe droughts, you can redirect camping and other activities into less vulnerable locations and treat/redesign those locations to reduce fire spread, you can make it difficult for people to stop along roads in vulnerable locations and instead channel stops into moister areas or locations where fire spread is less likely. Of course it would be good to increase fines for leaving campfires burning etc. There are other suggestions in Fire ecology in Rocky Mountain landscapes. There is a copy at NAU.</p>	
9	<p>The Proposed Action needs to review and base a landscape plan on historical landscape data. The Proposed Action does mention, under Forest Resiliency and Sustainability, the idea that the natural range of variation included “a mix of open, moderately closed, and closed canopy conditions at the fine (group) to landscape...scales.” This is good, and is in agreement with the tree-density reconstructions of Williams and Baker (2012 Figure 2) and other published sources. Please cite and use this document as one of your cited sources as supporting that historical landscapes had a large range in tree densities.</p> <p>This mix cannot have been produced by a frequent-fire regime, as this regime is consistently linked only to low-density forests with large trees. You have described the historical landscape as a mix of densities. Please abandon that unsupported notion, and embrace the mixed-severity fire regime evidence, which is the primary source of this mix of open to closed conditions. Of course, you are</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>correct to review evidence of effects on historical forests from droughts, disease, and insect outbreaks as well. The Plummer report, discussed below, has unique, comprehensive data on drought effects across the project area that I hope you will report and use.</p> <p>The Proposed Action, as it is in Tables 2 and 7 is too vague at this point, as I'm sure you know, with large ranges of basal area and tree density (e.g., 11-124 trees/acre). You will need, and perhaps already have, some scientific basis for determining the details of the mix of densities, basal areas, and other aspects of historical forest structure across the landscape, so that there is a well-supported scientific basis for the landscape restoration plan.</p> <p>As far as I know, there are only two widely available sources that provide spatially comprehensive information about the historical landscapes of the project area. Here they are:</p> <p>Plummer, F. G. 1904. Forest conditions in the Black Mesa Forest Reserve, Arizona. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper No. 23, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.</p> <p>Williams, M. A. and W. L. Baker. 2012. Spatially extensive reconstructions show variable-194 severity fire and heterogeneous structure in historical western United States dry forests. <i>Globa Ecology and Biogeography</i> 21:1042-1052.</p> <p>What you need, in my scientific opinion, is some way to estimate proportions of the project area that historically had various levels of tree density, basal area, perhaps timber volume, and forest composition, or at least indicators of variability in forest structure. Not all of this is available, but enough is to craft a reasonable plan. Calculating some actual distributions of various parameters 201 of historical forest structure is possible from Plummer, and I recommend it be used directly:</p> <p>Plummer (1904) provides township-by-township descriptions for about A.D. 1900 for most of the townships in the project area, including the following for each township:</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>a. verbal description of the quality and location of the ponderosa pine timber, including what percentage was “good quality” and whether it was “heavy” meaning dense</p> <p>b. estimate of timber volume for ponderosa in feet B.M. These estimates are difficult to translate into modern estimates of volume since they cruised it differently, but this is very good indicator to use in a relative way to estimate how variable forests were historically across the project area.</p> <p>c. composition - some estimates of volume for associated tree species, that could also be used in a relative way, and some verbal explanations of associated trees.</p> <p>d. average height - tells something about how variable the forest was, although height is not as important as other variables</p> <p>e. average diameter - of obvious value directly and also can compare across the townships to estimate the variability of mean tree diameter</p> <p>f. average age - this is important and also can be used to show variability across the landscape. This appears to show that a lot of the landscape was not very old, often between about 125-175 years on average.</p> <p>g. dead and diseased - these are useful to understand the state of the historical forest, which had just experienced a significant drought period (p. 18). But, these estimates should also be useful in understanding that significant amounts of dead and diseased trees were historically normal.</p> <p>h. Map in Plate VI. This shows some of the variability in the historical forest and how it was arrayed across the landscape. Look at the patches of timber in the three volume classes to see that there were large blocks and patches of forest with differing levels of timber volume. And, those volume levels were generally pretty low, likely because of fires and other disturbances. The restored forest should not be uniform or entirely old-growth forests.</p> <p>I would like to respectfully remind USFS that after quite a bit of discussion over objections to Phase 1 of 4FRI, it was determined by USFS that Phase 1 would be restoring tree densities and leaving dense-forest areas that are congruent with the</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>reconstructions of Williams and Baker (2012). That was good news, and I hope that similar congruence will be possible with Phase 2.</p> <p>Patterns in Williams and Baker’s maps of tree density and fire severity (2012) correspond reasonably well with patterns in the Plummer map of timber volumes, which was done about 10-20 years after the surveys. The western part of the Rim Country Project area corresponds with the southeastern part of the Mogollon Plateau panel in Figures 2 and 3 in Williams and Baker (2012), which shows moderate to high tree density (Fig. 2) and high-severity and mixed-severity fire (Fig. 3). These fires likely occurred early in the reconstruction period (which was about 1760-1880) and post-fire forests would have been about 100-120 years old at the time of the surveys in the late-1800s. This area was reconstructed to have evidence of high-severity fire because it had high tree density, few trees larger than 16" diameter, spatial contiguity, and some sharp borders with mature forest. This same area is highlighted in Plummer on p. 18, where he says “In Tps. 12 and 13 N., R 12 E, exceptionally heavy stands of young timber were noticed.</p> <p>These trees average about 10 or 12 inches in diameter...” Trees 10-12 inches diameter would likely have been 100-120 years old, agreeing with the Williams and Baker reconstruction for this area. This agreement is strong corroboration that both sources provide valid information about historical landscapes and corroborating evidence that this area likely burned at high severity. The Black Mesa panel in Figure 2 and 3 of Williams and Baker (2012) corresponds with the eastern half of the Rim Country Project area but extends beyond it. Similarly, the area of reconstructed high-severity fire west of Show Low in William and Baker’s Fig. 3 shows up on the Plummer map (Plate VI) in the lowest timber-volume class, reflecting a young forest, and the description of the township says: “The timber is generally small and rough, the best yellow pine being along the creek” (p. 39) consistent with a forest recovering from a high-severity fire in the late-1700s to early 1800s, that left surviving trees in moister areas along the creek.</p> <p>What you see in the Williams and Baker (2012) reconstructions and in the Plummer (1904) report and maps is similar coarse spatial heterogeneity in tree density (W&B) and timber volume (Plummer), produced by the same mixed-severity fires, that included some large patches of high-severity fire. Patches are similar, although mapping detail differs, and they are in similar places. I hope</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>you will use these two sources as a guide to formulate a landscape plan that will lead to a landscape, after restoration, that was guided by this historical landscape heterogeneity.</p>	
10	<p>The Proposed Action needs to show how the restored landscape will look and how fire will be managed to restore the fire regime, as required by the Omnibus Public Land Management Act</p> <p>The proposed action should lay out what the restored landscape will look like and how fire will ultimately be managed in the restored landscape, as without this vision, the Proposed Action appears to lead to nothing, when in fact it is clear that there is a very big vision to this project. Please explain these two missing and essential matters in detail, with accompanying maps, graphs, and tables giving the details.</p> <p>To meet the mandate of the Omnibus Act to restore the historical fire regime, I suggest an obvious goal for fire would be to maximize the area within which fire managers are able, after the project is done, to manage wildfire for resource benefit. I hope you agree, and agree that this should be clearly laid out in the Proposed Action, along with an explanation of the steps that will be taken to meet this goal. Also needed are explicit maps of where these areas will be or will not be. Where managed wildfire is not feasible, it is important to provide clarity about how fires will be managed to effectively restore the natural fire regime even in these areas. The EIS does need to propose explicit policy actions and locations to restore the historical fire regime.</p> <p>The Proposed Action should clearly demonstrate that the project is worthwhile and will achieve the goals required by the Omnibus Act, which is to restore the forest and restore the fire regime The plan itself and the extent of expected success in achieving these goals, along with the environmental impacts, should be on display in the draft EIS for every alternative.</p>	
11	<p>Use more fire to accomplish restoration itself The Kaibab National Forest is a national leader in wildland fire use and managing fire for resource benefits, yet this Proposed Action does not even mention using wildland fire to accomplish restoration, instead just mechanical/prescribed fire or prescribed fire alone. Please include use of wildland fire for resource benefit whenever and wherever it is possible to use it during the 10-year project period. Over the course of ten years, a great deal of restoration could likely be accomplished with this technique. Based on the Kaibab's achievement of 98% of wildfires managed for</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	resource benefit, over about 25,000 acres in one year, it would not be surprising if 10-20% of the project area could be restored this way, reducing costs and achieving better ecological results.	
12	Use the final agreement about how to treat and monitor MSO habitat Phase 1 of 4FRI, regarding the MSO, met with objections from Wild Earth Guardians and John Muir Project and an agreement was forged that phased in actions in MSO habitat, combined with monitoring and re-evaluation. Nothing about that agreement is in this new Proposed Action. Please go back to that agreement, explain it in detail in the draft EIS, along with whatever data have been collected, and put it back in as the preferred alternative. That could help avoid another round of objections, which would be a waste of everyone’s time and energy.	
13	Too much area for “Facilitative operations” (p. 14) is proposed It should not take 157,270 acres of area to facilitate adjoining actions—that is a huge area to prescribe burn just to allow mechanical/prescribed burned next door. This need should just require a small area and most of this can be right within the actual treatment area by blackening the margins first.	
14	<p>Don’t plant the 69,360 acres of burned forests that you are calling “understocked”. Both the Williams and Baker (2012) reconstruction and the Plummer (1904) report show treeless areas and grasslands. These were likely created or maintained historically in part by high-severity fires, as they were historically closely intermixed with high-severity fire areas (W&B Fig. 3)</p> <p>Early successional habitat is very rare in western dry forests because it is typically planted to meet forestry goals, as indicated here by the use of the term “understocked” in this case. However, this is an ecological restoration project where the habitats that are created by fire should be left to slowly return to forest, rather than being planted to expedite forestry goals. It especially makes no sense to remove trees in existing grasslands to restore grasslands but plant trees in other grasslands (those created by fire). It is particularly important to not plant these fire- created grasslands, especially since restoring grasslands is a high priority for the Arizona Partner in Flight bird conservation plan.</p>	
15	<p>Lots of other good things in the Proposed Action too.</p> <p>Decommissioning roads, relocating roads having adverse impacts, restoring hydrologic function in meadows and springs, restoring riparian areas are all wonderful to see in the restoration program.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	I appreciate your attention to the concerns I raise in this letter. I know that the task you have is very large already.	
Letter 16		Tom Mackin Secretary/Treasurer Coconino Sportsmen
1	The Coconino Sportsmen welcome this opportunity to comment on the 4FRI Rim Country Project Proposed Action. As a 60+ year local sportsman’s organization that has been active over the decades on forest, wildlife and other related issues we support and agree with the letter submitted by John Hamill of the TRCP. In addition we would like to submit the following additional comments to supplement those topics included in the TRCP letter.	
2	<p>When discussing the project Purpose and Need we could not agree more on all of the purposes outlined, restoration of forest health, structure, function and resiliency are absolutely necessary to meet mutually beneficial goals. Current conditions are a far cry from the historic norm and we’re fortunate today to have the knowledge, experience and desire to remedy this problem. Unfortunately there does exist roadblocks to the success of this project including adequate funding, balancing of priorities, contractor activities and fulfillment of obligations, frequent turnover of key personnel and stringent social and industrial pressures.</p> <p>We realize that we’re not going to please everyone regardless of the scientific knowledge available but we cannot afford to ignore proven facts and scientific evidence in order to appease personal opinions or that of a small but highly vocal portion of the public. A balanced adherence to procedures and treatments that achieve the needs and purposes of the project must be kept in the forefront at all times without undo emphasis on any one of the goals. We know how we’ve arrived at the current conditions and we know what it takes to attain the desired conditions and that should be first and foremost with any activities in our forests and other public lands.</p>	
3	<p>When discussing the specific proposed actions on page 14 of the document I’ve received we’d like to make the following comments or suggestions</p> <p>When it comes mechanical thinning and prescribed burning, whenever possible insure that multiple objectives are being considered. For example, thinning or prescribed fire on MSO PAC’s or NGH areas should be done in a manner that also reduces the undesirable effects of fire. There will be limited or no MSO or NGH activity in an area that suffers high severity wildfire. Wildlife is resilient</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	and adaptable to various conditions as long as minimum carrying capacity conditions exist.	
4	Roads should be managed as part of the TMP program and not dependent on 4FRI budgets or priorities. The ongoing discussions and resulting changes to roads and other access opportunities is a program that has shown to be feasible and effective when coupled with appropriate enforcement activities and budget appropriations.	
5	Numerous opportunities exist for volunteer activities to carry out objectives related to meadow, wetland and riparian areas and these opportunities should be explored and implemented whenever possible.	
6	There have been many activities already completed to inventory springs and assess their current conditions. Like many other areas of concern, the knowledge and experience in what should and must be done already exists and all possible opportunities for collaboration and financial support/sharing should be implemented.	
7	In regard to protective barriers, a topic we have a great deal of experience with, planning and implementation must include discussions for future maintenance, access, monitoring and possible decommissioning once appropriate. Within the project area there are existing sites where barriers were constructed that have not been maintained or monitored and the costs of the initial development were wasted due to the lack of adequate planning and foresight.	
8	Finally, we understand that not all of the proposed actions will be completed at the same time or in the same order so prioritization and order and location of treatments should be planned to make the most of available resources. In addition, with resources and planning already built into the schedule, resolving other problems, like the removal of unnecessary pasture and allotment fences, removal of old, ineffective or significantly damaged aspen or wetland exclosures and general housekeeping on forest lands should be included under the proposed actions.	
9	Again, thank you for this opportunity and we look forward to continued involvement with the 4FRI effort and we hope to see improved education and information sharing on some of the misconceptions regarding the proposed actions, like the need to have prescribed or managed fires and the inevitable smoke that may accompany these activities.	
Letter 17		Judy Prosser, Bar T Bar Ranch, INC.
1	In response to your request for comments to the 4FRI Rim Country Project Proposed Action, we would like to make the following comments:	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	Generally we are strongly supportive of the Purpose & Need for the project. We are in support of any means to expedite and/or make the process more efficient. Time is of the essence.	
2	Page 4 & Page 24, where "Facilitative Operations" is defined: if fire is utilized in the pinon-juniper, we would suggest that there is aggressive removal of the "PJ". Grassland fires do not have the same positive effect as direct elimination of trees.	
3	Page 8, 4th paragraph, reference to pronghorn as "Management Indicator Species "(MIS). It is our understanding that under the new Forest Plan, that term is obsolete, and no longer management protocol. It has a tendency to attract legal issues and in our opinion, should not be used.	
4	Page 12 & 26: Spring Restoration treatment, namely fencing, or "protective barriers". There should be advance research to determine if the water rights are owned by a Grazing Permittee. In the event they are owned by a Permittee, then there would have to be mutual agreement to fence off the spring from grazing ungulates. Mitigation measures might include piping water to an alternative location.	
5	Page 13, Habitat for rare plant species: increase individual recruitment of aspen, etc. there is mention of "protective barriers placed around sites to prevent browsing and other disturbance during regeneration". We suggest that fencing should be at a minimum because it requires maintenance and historically that is a difficult order for the USFS to perform. It ends up not getting done, creates a bigger problem for large ungulates, and is an unsightly, and potentially dangerous mess in the forest.	
6	<p>Page 14 Stream Habitat Restoration: "Restore 360 miles of stream habitat..." Given that extraordinary amount, it needs to be low maintenance, or it will not get maintained.</p> <p>Page 26 Riparian Stream & Stream Channel Restoration: "Protecting sites from grazing ungulates,...and/or removing stock tanks". This could be, once again, a water rights issue, which needs to be investigated first. Second, even if the water rights are not owned by the Grazing Permittee, removing stock tanks should not be allowed, unless the Permittee is in full agreement. IF, the Permittee is in agreement, a provision for an alternative water source should be considered. Stock tanks are important to livestock and wildlife and typically were built to improve utilization by livestock(in consultation with the USFS Range Conservation Staff). The location of stock tanks are an integral part of managed</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	grazing. Permittees are expected to adhere to grazing plans and removal of stock tanks could negatively alter their ability to do so.	
7	Burning in the name of "Restoration" needs to accomplish that objective. Restoration needs to kill the targeted number of trees. Burning grass and pine needles does not accomplish the same objectives.	
8	Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	
Letter 18		Duke Grant
1	The first general comment regarding the plan is to point out that the restoration project is established to increase the health of the forest ecosystem by removing much of the Ponderosa Pine and subspecies of the forest, down to 25% of the existing forest in the treated areas. It is of great concern to note that scientists predict that due to drought and continued warming and climate change and severe annual wildfires that up to 50% of the forest system will be gone by the year 2050, and much more by the year 2100.(see reference at bottom of page.)	
2	Scientists state that there is a real possibility of secondary succession and growth of new warmer climate tolerant species of trees and environmental desertification may likely take the place of the Ponderosa Pine forest in the future once enough of the existing forest is damaged by drought and/or mechanically removal by thinning operations.	
3	<p>With these new environmental conditions it is very important to maintain as much of the original ecosystem as possible while completing the 4FRI Action Plan objectives. The real concern being that if too much of the forest system is removed or interrupted by the 4FRI actions it is very possible that combined with the continued drought and climate change issues, the forest ecosystem may be irreversibly damaged.</p> <p>Therefore, it is strongly recommended that the desired condition (DC)" % Max Stand Density Index " from Tables 2 and 7 not be less than 45% for Ponderosea Pine, and 35% for any other species.</p> <p>Under the "Mechanical Treatments" chart for uneven aged group selection Ponderosa Pine should have interspaces over 10 to 60% of the stand, and not 10 to 90% to maintain the forest in the current drought conditions.</p> <p>Furthermore Single Tree selection of Ponderosa Pine, pine Gamble, and pine Evergreen Oak should have openings of less than or equal to 1/5 acre in size, and not 1/4 acre. The stand Improvement for Ponderosa Pine et al, should be young</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>even-aged stands dominated by trees less than 8 inches in diameter to improve growth and vigor, and not 8.5 inches.</p> <p>These minor modifications will go a long way in ensuring the health of the forest in severe drought and wildfire conditions that we are currently experiencing.</p>	
4	<p>Furthermore, local water companies like Arizona Water in Lakeside have already detected a herbicide in their public water supply due to the actions of thinning / logging companies working in the area. Therefore it is of the utmost importance to eliminate any further potential water shed contamination by the action from the USFS 4 Fri contractors who use glyphosate, or other herbicides during their facilitative actions in this scope of work.</p> <p>The Deputy Director of the Arizona Forest Department has already stated concerns in an article from The Daily Star that the 4 Fri scope of work over the next 10 to 20 years may not be sustainable in regards to the forest ecosystem. It is important to maintain a healthy Forest system as well as a healthy local economy, but sustainable forest management should not be compromised for any reason.</p> <p>Balancing these two can be a challenge especially given the extreme environmental conditions that we are now facing. It might be better to err on the side of caution then to have hindsight after causing potentially permanent ecological damage to the Worlds largest Ponderosa Pine Forest ecosystem.</p>	
5	Thank you for your consideration of these comments.	NEPA
Letter 19		Stephen Clark Executive Director, Arizona Elk Society
1	<p>We are encouraged with this phase of 4 FRI in that you have identified riparian areas, streams and springs that need to be worked on in conjunction with the tree thinning. In your analysis you identified the springs and riparian areas and the human caused issues related to the damage and reduced functioning. But you left out the fact that overgrown forests have limited the amount of water and runoff available due to the needs of the trees and overgrowth. The AES has been very successful in showing that reducing the conifers and junipers in areas of springs, streams and riparian creek has resulted in the increase in water. Also if you reduce water stealing trees you increase watershed and need to improve riparian</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>areas and creeks, that are currently damaged, to protect them from further damage.</p>	
2	<p>Please consider the following comments on the June 2016 Four Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI) Rim Country EIS Proposed Action.</p> <p>Project Objective, Purpose and Need: AES supports the objective of the Rim Country Proposed Action “to reestablish and restore forest structure and pattern, forest health, and vegetation composition and diversity in ponderosa pine ecosystems to conditions within the natural range of variation, thus moving the project area toward the desired conditions.” We further support the Purposes and Needs stated for the Proposed Action to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase forest resiliency and sustainability; • Reduce risk of undesirable fire effects; • Improve terrestrial and aquatic species habitat; • Improve the condition and function of streams and springs; • Restore woody riparian vegetation; • Preserve cultural resources; • Support sustainable forest products industries 	
3	<p>Increase and broaden the wildlife focus The AES would like to see the Proposed Action include a broader scope of wildlife habitat restoration needs and actions not just those benefitting federally protected species. Many Arizona sportsmen utilize and depend on the project area for a quality hunting and fishing experience. Hunting and Fishing is an important part of the multiple use of the Forest. A recent state-wide survey conducted by the Arizona Game and Fish Department indicates that the project area includes some of the State’s mostly highly valued hunting and fishing areas for elk, deer, turkey, trout, and pronghorn antelope (see: www.azgfd.com/Recreation/ValueMapping). Hunting and fishing for these species are economically and socially important to local and neighboring communities. As such, we recommend that the Purpose and Need should be expanded to include “Support quality hunting and fishing opportunities”. The proposed action and treatments should emphasize actions that will improve terrestrial and aquatic habitat conditions, maintain/restore functioning wildlife migration corridors, and provide reasonable access. In addition, the Proposed Action should address increasing wildlife diversity by increasing spatial heterogeneity of habitat components for both aquatic and terrestrial wildlife.</p>	
4	<p>Emphasize wildlife waters Many wildlife waters (including tanks, water collection aprons, drinkers, etc.) in the project area have been degraded or are no longer functioning due to damage</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>from catastrophic wildfire or lack of maintenance. These waters need to be repaired (i.e., sediment removal) or replaced. For waters that are exclusively wildlife waters, exclusion fencing may need repair or replacement to keep livestock out. There are other areas of wildlife habitat that have been identified for the installation of new waters. These repairs, replacements, and installations will improve habitat for wildlife and improve wildlife distribution across the landscape.</p>	
5	<p>Emphasize wildlife connectivity and migration corridors An objective of the Proposed Action should be to create and restore wildlife corridors through thinning to connect wildlife habitat blocks on the landscape. For example, emphasis should be placed on mechanical treatments that will maintain and/or restore montane meadow connectivity through the removal of trees, including juniper and large young trees where wildlife travel corridors have been identified.</p> <p>Within the Rim Country project area, fence improvements and modifications would benefit wildlife through increasing wildlife connectivity on the landscape. For example, unnecessary fences need to be removed to allow wildlife to move through important movement corridors between habitat blocks. There are also other fences that require repair to keep livestock within allotments and protect sensitive wildlife resources. Wildlife would also benefit from wildlife friendly modifications to other fences that would retain livestock while allowing wildlife to cross.</p>	
6	<p>Clarify the decommissioning roads will be done pursuant to approved Travel Management Rules (TMR) Decommissioning of roads should be done in accordance with approved TMR's process not the Rim Country EIS. Page 5 (Roads) indicates that "there is a need to decommission unneeded routes identified during the forest Travel Management Rule review processes as part of the restoration of the landscape in the project area." However, page 14 indicates that the Proposed Action will:</p> <p>Decommission approximately 230 miles of existing system and unauthorized roads on the Coconino and Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests. Decommission approximately 20 miles of unauthorized roads on the Tonto National Forest.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Improve approximately 150 miles of existing non-system roads and construct approximately 350 miles of temporary roads for haul access; decommission when treatments are completed.</p> <p>Relocate and reconstruct existing open roads adversely affecting water quality and natural resources, or of concern to human safety.</p> <p>It's unclear whether these proposed actions are authorized in approved TMR's.</p>	
7	<p>Emphasize and expand the scope of stream restoration actions</p> <p>The project area includes numerous streams that support some of the most productive trout fisheries in the state and contribute to Arizona's vital water supplies. The project area is home to native Gila and Apache trout that are important from both a conservation and recreational perspective. The proposed forestry restoration combined with thoughtful hydrologic rehabilitation can produce resilient, sustainable and highly functioning watersheds that supports both native and recreational fisheries. All perennial, ephemeral, or intermittent streams (not just those identified in Figure 6, page 19) should be eligible under the EIS to receive restoration and or improvements, if needed. Not all these streams may need restoration or special treatment, but the EIS should provide the necessary compliance if restoration or special treatment is deemed appropriate. Prior to mechanical or fire restoration treatments, the hydrologic impacts of the treatment to streams, aquatic ecosystems, and riparian areas should be formally evaluated. Treatments should be adjusted to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts.</p>	
8	<p>Thank you for considering these comments and for all the hard work of the 4FRI EIS team to work collaboratively with stakeholders to prepare the Rim Country EIS. The Arizona Elk Society is very encouraged to be part of this phase due to the inclusion of the rest of the ecosystem improvements. Please contact me if you have questions or need additional information.</p>	
Letter 20		Arthur Firstenberg
1	<p>The Four Forests Ruination Initiative (4FRI) is a planning effort designed to remove 95% of the trees from over two million acres of Arizona's forests and destroy forest resiliency for the benefit of timber, oil and gas, mining, geothermal and cattle grazing interests, as well as the prescribed burning industry and others wishing to exploit public lands for private profit.</p>	
2	<p>The Deforestation Service is no longer hiding its real agenda or pretending any more that this has anything whatever to do with ecological restoration or fire prevention. It is about removing as many trees as possible and setting as many fires as possible. This is stated right out front in Senate Bill 1691, introduced in the U.S. Senate on June 25, 2016. S. 1691 <i>defines</i> "restoration" as "timber</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	harvesting, thinning, prescribed fire, or other vegetation manipulation in the National Forest System.” The bill also mandates a minimum of one million acres of burning per year and 400,000 acres of timber sales per year.	
3	<p>The Deforestation Service also no longer pretends that public comments will have any effect on its plans, or that Environmental Impact Statements are anything more than a charade. S. 1691 and House Bill 2647, which was passed by the House of Representatives on July 9, 2015, will make it impossible for private citizens to ever again challenge an EIS in court. Both bills contain language requiring any person who wishes to challenge a deforestation plan in court to post a bond equal to the Deforestation Service’s estimated costs, expenses and attorneys’ fees in defending the lawsuit.</p> <p>If H.R. 2647 is passed by the Senate and signed into law, Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements won’t even be required any more. H.R. 2647 will categorically exclude prescribed burning projects from environmental review. Another Senate bill, S. 2012, has already passed the Senate and the House and is in conference committee. This bill awards categorical exclusions to “vegetation management” plans in the rights-of-way of electric power lines “and adjacent Federal lands.”</p>	
4	The Deforestation Service awarded the contract for the first million acres of 4FRI to an international land and timber broker called Good Earth Power, a company based in the Sultanate of Oman, with partners in England and China. Little or none of that lumber is staying in the United States. International Forest Products, LLC, a subsidiary of The Kraft Group, is marketing the lumber harvested by Good Earth Power from Arizona’s forests (340 million board feet per year) on the international market.	
5	After most of the trees are gone, the National Forests will have lost their reason for being. Real estate developers are already salivating over what may soon be the former Coconino, Kaibab, Apache-Sitgreaves, and Tonto National Forests. There isn’t a word of truth in the 32-page scoping document describing the 4FRI Rim Country Project.	
Letter 21		Fred Gaudet, Arizona Trail Association Board of Directors
1	The proposed project will have a temporary negative impact but a long-term positive impact on the Arizona National Scenic Trail (AZT) west of SR87 and the experience of trail users, including hikers, runners, backpackers, mountain bikers and equestrians. The AZT is an 800-mile National Scenic Trail and State	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Scenic Trail that is among the greatest natural resources in the nation. It attracts locals and international visitors alike, and has become increasingly popular since its completion in 2011. It is an economic engine for the state of Arizona as well as the 33 Arizona Trail Gateway Communities, including the towns of Strawberry, Pine, Mormon Lake Village and Flagstaff.</p> <p>As the administering agency of the AZT, the USDA Forest Service has an important responsibility in the protection of the trail. As the nonprofit organization whose mission is to build, maintain, promote, protect and sustain the Arizona Trail, the Arizona Trail Association (ATA) submits these scoping comments.</p>	
2	<p>The ATA supports the proposed ecosystem thinning and burning treatments that will protect all recreational trails in the 4FRI Rim Country Project, including the AZT, over the long term. The Arizona National Scenic Trail and other trails are important values at risk, and as such, will be protected by the proposed actions of the 4FRI Rim Country Project. The Design Features, Best Management Practices, and Mitigation for Recreation, Trails, Scenery, and Special Areas of Appendix C of the 2013 DEIS are most appropriate and positive mitigations and would protect the recreational values and scenic views for all trails, including the AZT.</p>	
3	<p>As part of RS7, Recreation and Other Trail Mitigation, particularly important for users of the AZT, is notification to the public when forest restoration activities are scheduled. Specifically, District Recreational Specialists should “ensure well marked and publicized detour routes for the Arizona Trail” (p. 18). Sending announcements or media releases directly to the Arizona Trail Association will inform over 10,000 ATA members and supporters, and more importantly, users of the AZT about thinning/burning activities or detours along the AZT.</p>	
4	<p>Additional design features, best practices, and mitigation specific to the Arizona National Scenic Trail that need to be addressed for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement include the following from Appendix C:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid using the AZT as a boundary and have minimal marking of trees within the Arizona Trail corridor (RS2 p. 14). 2. The highest emphasis for slash treatment, temporary road closures, and road decommissioning will be placed on foreground of a number of entities including national scenic, historical or recreational trails (RS3(d) p. 14-15). 3. “National, Historic, and Recreational Trails as well as forest system trails . . . will not be used as temporary roads or skid trails”(RS3(h) p. 15). Any perpendicular trail crossing will be restored to pre-project conditions. “Crossing 	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>of the Arizona Trail will be done sparingly and only if no other alternative exits” (RS3(i) p. 15).</p> <p>4. Slash piles should be at least 300’ from the AZT and fire control lines on the AZT need to be coordinated with district recreational staff (RS3 and RS4 p. 16).</p> <p>5. Jack straw treatment shall not be implemented within 1,000’ of the AZT (RS6 p.16).</p> <p>6. Along the AZT, character trees of unique form or shape should be retained when feasible. Avoid abrupt changes in the landscape along the AZT trail corridor (RS7(d) p. 17).</p>	
5	<p>The ATA also recommends adding an additional mitigation: where possible, while implementing proposed treatments, make improvements within recreation sites and along trails. Examples include cleaning up logs and debris from past projects and removing hazard trees and downed timber across trails.</p>	
6	<p>Design Features, Best Management Practices, and Mitigation for Recreation, Trails, Scenery, and Special Areas should be explicitly communicated to all individuals working on the project, not only stated in prescriptions for treatment within contracts, but also communicated to each person involved in thinning and/or burning. Individual workers need to understand the importance of the Arizona National Scenic Trail and how their work can positively or negatively impact this important resource. Forest Service personnel and ATA Trail Stewards should monitor and evaluate activities as they progress, not just upon completion.</p>	
7	<p>Thank you for your time and effort to review these scoping comments. The ATA looks forward to this proposed action moving ahead to the Environmental Impact Statement and ultimately to activities in the forest that will protect the AZT and more importantly the forest, watersheds, wildlife and other items. If you have any questions, or would like additional comments, including an in-person meeting, please contact Matthew Nelson, Executive Director or me.</p>	
<p>Letters 22, 23, and 24</p>		<p>Pascal Berlioux, Eastern AZ Counties Org. Tommie Martin, Gila County Board of Supervisors, and Jason Whiting, Navajo County Board of Supervisors The Eastern Counties, Gila and Navajo Counties</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
		submitted the same comments. Each comment letter is entered in the project record as a separate letter and will be addressed in this comment table together.
1	<p>In collaboration with the Forest Service, ECO has been an integral part of the 4FRI planning effort since 2009. Together we successfully developed in 2015 a robust Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision for the 1st 4FRI analysis area that is now being implemented as part of the largest forest restoration effort in the country. We look forward to duplicating this success with the Rim Country EIS in order to extend restoration treatments along the entire Mogollon Rim, over an area totaling in excess of 2 million acres.</p> <p>The comments expressed in this letter represent the views of the Eastern Arizona Counties Organization. The Eastern Arizona Counties Organization regroups the six counties of Apache, Navajo, Gila, Greenlee, Graham and Cochise, most of which stand to be directly impact by the Rim Country Proposed Action.</p> <p>This letter has two purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To express strong support for the Rim Country Analysis; 2. To provide scoping comments regarding the Rim Country Proposed Action. 	
2	<p>I - Support for the Rim Country Project</p> <p>As amply documented by the conservation, academic and agency scientists, and as generally well supported by an overwhelming majority of stakeholders, the highly departed current conditions of the forested ecosystems in the Rim Country require action to re-establish forest structure, pattern and function, in order to increase forest resiliency and reduce the risk of uncharacteristic fire behavior.</p> <p>ECO therefore strongly supports the objective of the Rim Country Analysis “to reestablish and restore forest structure and pattern, forest health, and vegetation composition and diversity in ponderosa pine ecosystems to conditions within the natural range of variation, thus moving the project area toward the desired conditions” (Rim Country Proposed Action).</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>ECO further strongly supports the desired outcome of “improving structure and function (and) increas(ing) ecosystem resiliency (and) the ability of [the Rim Country] ecosystem to survive natural disturbances such as fire, insects and disease, and climate change without changing its inherent function” (Rim Country Proposed Action).</p> <p>Therefore, ECO strongly supports the Purposes and Needs stated for the Rim Country Project to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Increase forest resiliency and sustainability; • Reduce risk of undesirable fire effects; • Improve terrestrial and aquatic species habitat; • Improve the condition and function of streams and springs; • Restore woody riparian vegetation; • Preserve cultural resources; • Support sustainable forest products industries” <p>(Rim Country Proposed Action).</p>	
3	<p>II - Comments on the Rim Country Proposed Action</p> <p>1) Good Starting Point Document</p> <p>ECO appreciates the overall quality and comprehensiveness of the Proposed Action, and passes on a resounding “Well Done!” to the people and the team responsible for it.</p>	
4	<p>2) Need to Include All Stakeholders Input</p> <p>ECO appreciates that much of the early stakeholder input has been integrated in the Proposed Action, as illustrated in the cross-walk document <i>How Feedback on Rim Country draft PA was Addressed</i>. However, the stakeholders noted a number of areas in which the Proposed Action could more fully incorporate comments provided on the Draft Proposed Action. These include issues and opportunities related to habitat restoration and management for terrestrial and aquatic wildlife.</p> <p>We request that all input from all stakeholders be considered and analyzed in the EIS, and that the Forest Service extend all possible opportunities to stakeholders to not only provide, but further discuss their input with the interdisciplinary team. In the spirit of collaboration, and to ensure transparency, when stakeholders’ input is not included, a disclosure and explanation of the decision should be shared with the stakeholders.</p>	
5	<p>3) Need for Details</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>ECO understands and appreciates that a Proposed Action, by its very nature, cannot be – and should not be - as detailed as an Action Alternative, or as an Impact Analysis.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that the extremely general short paragraphs that describe possible restoration actions, such as the paragraphs on Proposed Treatments (p. 21), Grassland and Meadow Restoration (p. 25), Spring Restoration (p. 26), Riparian Stream and Stream Channel Restoration (p. 26), Stream Habitat Restoration (p. 26), Aspen Restoration (p. 26), do not convey anything more substantial than generalities, and do not provide the public with a meaningful understanding of the number, intensity, distribution, timing or potential effects of the actions that are being proposed.</p> <p>From a different perspective, we observe that some new terms such as “No Fire” (e.g. Tables 3 & 4, p. 7) have appeared but are not specifically defined, and that the language addressing the long standing issue of old growth and future old growth shifts from the notion of “old trees” to “large trees” to “old and large trees.” Additional consistency and definition of terms used, is needed.</p> <p>We fully expect that the Rim Country EIS Action Alternatives and associated Effects Analyses will provide all needed details for each Action Alternative and Effects Analysis, and that these details will be made available to the Stakeholder Group in a timely manner, so that Stakeholders can conduct additional analysis and provide input to the Forest Service.</p> <p>We further request that the proposed management actions in old growth and future old growth (large young trees) stands be very explicit, and include the clear statement that no old growth trees (predating Euro-American settlement or currently exhibiting old growth structural characteristics) shall be cut. Regarding the Stands with Preponderance of Large Young Trees (SPLYT), we request that the unfinished work currently underway in the Planning Workgroup between the stakeholders and the Forest Service continue in order to jointly and collaboratively identify the most accurate descriptors and characterizers for the SPLYT, and the most appropriate treatments for these stands. This issue is very important to the Stakeholder Group.</p>	
6	<p>4) Need to Increase and Broaden the Wildlife Focus</p> <p>The Proposed Action would benefit from inclusion of a broader scope of wildlife habitat restoration needs and actions. Notably, the Proposed Action should address increasing wildlife diversity through increased spatial heterogeneity of</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>habitat components for aquatic and terrestrial wildlife within the footprint, not just those that are federally protected.</p> <p>ECO understands that the Cooperating Agency relationship between the Forest Service and the Arizona Game & Fish Department will be a conduit for addressing some of these concerns. However, input from other stakeholders should be fully incorporated at the scoping stage as well, as there is no certainty that the Forest Service will include such input later in the NEPA process. The Stakeholders request that their issues be included in the Proposed Action to ensure that they are analyzed in the NEPA process.</p> <p>We therefore request that the wildlife focus be significantly increased and broadened, and that all interested stakeholders be given full opportunity to contribute to the development of restoration actions that relate to fish and wildlife.</p>	
7	<p>5) Need to Increase and Broaden the Attention to Socio-Economic Issues ECO appreciates the fact that the Forest Service modified its first draft of the Proposed Action to include a Statement of Socio-Economic Purposes & Needs, and an accompanying short narrative in response to the input of the Stakeholder Group.</p> <p>However, we are concerned that this narrative may indicate a worrisome bias when stating: “Engaging industry would offer the opportunity to cover all, or nearly all, of the cost of removal of forest restoration byproducts by the value of the products removed” (Rim Country Proposed Action). While in many cases this statement may be perfectly appropriate, there also exist many cases in which this statement may be leading to unrealistic expectations. Treatment types, biomass removal specifications, current conditions, desired conditions, and maybe above all, treatment locations and hauling distances, are all critical factors that contribute in making the value of the material removed sufficient, or not, and sometimes by far, to fully offset the costs of treatments.</p> <p>ECO therefore requests that socio-economic current existing conditions and socio-economic desired conditions be added during the NEPA process to support the socio-economic statement of purposes and needs, and that detailed analyses of the economic viability of the treatments be conducted during the EIS process, treatment area by treatment area, to guide the Implementation Plan, and,</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	ultimately, inform the selection of the contracting and packaging mechanisms of the treatments.	
8	<p>6) Need for In-Depth Descriptions and Analyses of Proposed Treatments and Restoration Actions</p> <p>As previously noted in Section 3 <i>Need for Details</i>, the paragraph on Proposed Treatments (p. 21) is extremely general. Further, the <i>Mechanical Treatments</i> table (pp. 22 to 25) outlines a series of ranges of treatment descriptions and objectives (e.g.: Uneven-aged Group Selection in Ponderosa Pine: “thin stands to 20-80 square feet of basal area and establish interspaces over 10-90% of the stand;” Uneven-aged Group Selection in Dry Mixed Conifers: “thin tree groups to 30-100 square feet of basal area;” Intermediate Thin in Ponderosa Pine: “thin tree groups to 70-90 square feet of basal area;” Intermediate Thin in Dry Mixed Conifers: “thin tree groups to 40-100 square feet of basal area;” etc.) but there is no indication of any distribution of treatment intensities across the sites, creating the possibility, that ALL treatments could be implemented at the highest, or lowest, intensity of the ranges, while technically remaining within the specified ranges.</p> <p>Further, the treatment descriptions and objectives do not reference the Best Available Science Information (BASI) sources necessary to assess whether the treatments are likely to meet the objectives of the Proposed Action in the relevant stands, or how the direct or indirect effects of the treatments will impact the neighboring stands.</p> <p>Finally, all the proposed mechanical treatments include the statement “and/or Prescribed Fire” (Table 9). We are concerned that many treatments need to include both mechanical thinning “and” prescribed fire. In many cases fire cannot be reintroduced before thinning first, and in most cases thinning should be followed by prescribed fire.</p> <p>ECO therefore requests that the EIS include an in depth description and analysis of the proposed treatment and restoration actions, including the Best Available Science Information (BASI) supporting the design and selection of the treatments, the sequencing of mechanical and prescribed fire treatments, and the detailed analysis of the direct and indirect ecological impacts of the treatments in the Rim Country Analysis.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>ECO further requests the thorough development of a range of Action Alternatives that addresses the effects of treatment types, treatment intensities, and the cumulative effects of implementation actions across the landscape.</p> <p>In addition, ECO requests that the development of Rim Country Action Alternatives, and their analyses, include additional restoration actions, such as but not limited to restoration of riparian and aquatic habitats, in all those areas and projects (e.g. Cragin Watershed Protection Project (CWPP)), that are located within the Rim Country EIS footprint, and that have been, or are going to be mechanically thinned for wildfire protection or fuels management purposes under separate NEPA analyses.</p>	
9	<p>7) Need to Integrate Monitoring and Adaptive Management Flexible Tools</p> <p>ECO is concerned that Monitoring and Adaptive Management are not explicitly addressed in the Proposed Action.</p> <p>This is an important issue for ECO. Previous scoping comments for the first 4FRI Proposed Action are still relevant for this Proposed Action: “In addition to the need for a targeted and efficient monitoring program, we also would like to emphasize the tremendous opportunity provided by the 4FRI to increase our understanding of the ecology of these systems. Given the 4FRI’s commitment to being a science-based endeavor we would ask that the Forest Service help cultivate an atmosphere that is conducive to research being conducted by a variety of partners. Adaptive management requires explicit statement of goals and objectives, and a well-informed monitoring program that has the requisite power to detect management impacts rapidly enough to inform future management. Furthermore, adaptive management is a structured decision-making process that relies on clearly articulated triggers for management change. Finally, adaptive management requires a commitment to change management when monitoring data indicates that the thresholds identified by those triggers have been crossed” (SHG Comments 1st 4FRI EIS).</p> <p>ECO requests that the Forest Service engage collaboratively with the 4FRI Stakeholder Group to develop a comprehensive Monitoring and</p>	
10	<p>ECO appreciates the efforts deployed by the Coconino, Tonto and Apache-Sitgreaves national forests and the USFS 4FRI staff and leadership to perform the thoroughly robust Environmental Impact Statement that the Rim Country</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Project deserves, and we urge the Forest Service Team to complete this task in the timeliest manner.</p> <p>We expect to be actively involved in the development of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Rim Country Project; we hereby reserve the right to provide further comments as the process unfolds; and, in the spirit of collaboration, we respectfully request that the Forest Service commit to receiving and considering further comments and emerging ideas provided under the auspices of continuous scoping as the Action Alternatives are developed and the Effects Analyses are conducted. ECO scoping comments on Rim Country Proposed Action.</p> <p>ECO is committed to working with the Forest Service to design, implement and monitor an ecologically, economically, legally and socially robust Environmental Impact Statement</p>	
Letter 25		Joyce Francis Habitat, Evaluation, and Lands Branch Chief AZGF Dept.
1	<p>The Arizona Game and Fish Department (Department) appreciates the opportunity to work collaboratively with the United States Forest Service (USFS) as a cooperating agency on the Rim Country Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Four Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI) Rim Country Project (Project). The 4FRI Project has the potential to benefit Arizona's terrestrial and aquatic wildlife resources, as well as the people who use and value those resources. The Department looks forward to continued cooperation to make this landscape-scale project successful from planning to implementation, and provides the following comments on the Rim Country Proposed Action (PA).</p>	
2	<p>The EIS is being developed through a diverse, multi-partner, multi-agency stakeholder group (SHG). The Department requests the USFS outline the collaboration and partnership of the SHG within the EIS as well as the Department's role as cooperating agency, member of the SHG, and Project Core Team.</p>	
3	<p>The Department requests monitoring and adaptive management be included as essential components within the PA. Monitoring of terrestrial and aquatic wildlife and their habitat is necessary for determining if restoration activities are effective, and that treatments are managed adaptively to avoid and/or minimize</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>the potential for negative impacts to species and/or the habitats. Aquatic habitat monitoring is particularly critical to ensure thinning and burning are not resulting in long-term negative impacts to watershed health. The Department has developed and implemented stream habitat monitoring techniques within the project area and would like to partner with USFS to continue to implement the appropriate monitoring techniques, as was done in the first 4FRI EIS with the multi-party monitoring board. The Department considers monitoring and adaptive management critical aspects of success for landscape scale restoration, and requests that the USFS continue engagement with the Department and the SHG to ensure these elements are appropriately incorporated and implemented.</p>	
4	<p>The large tree and old tree implementation plans (LTIP/OTIP) were a product of discussions during the development of the first 4FRI EIS. The Department believes the Rim Country PA does not sufficiently emphasize the importance of these plans. The Department understands that the vegetative communities are more complex within the Project than those within the first 4FRI EIS, and that the criteria for preponderance of large young trees (PL YT) and high canopy closure patches within the Project would be defined in close collaboration with the SHG. However, the Department requests that the EIS provide greater clarity with respect to application of the LTIP/OTIP, and place more emphasis on the wildlife value of presettlement and old growth trees.</p>	
5	<p>Issues of clarity and consistency (throughout) Will and would are used interchangeably for proposed actions. The use of "will" is perceived as predecisional; suggest use of "would" instead. (throughout) Lack of definition of scale is an issue throughout the PA. For example, Table 7 (p 11) provides desired conditions, but does not indicate the scale for average basal area for cover types. (throughout) Define cover types for clarity.</p> <p>The Department is specifically interested in definitions of grassland, savanna, meadow, wet meadow, and wetlands. We also requests that dry meadow be included and defined. (p 3, paragraph 2) The purpose statement focuses on ponderosa pine, and does not mention other forest cover/habitat types present in the project area, even though they cover a broad area. Broaden appropriately. (p 3, paragraph 3, under Forest Resiliency and Sustainability) The analysis area includes wet mixed-conifer with longer fire-return intervals; we request that this be addressed here as well. (p. 3, paragraph 5) Savannah cover types have likewise been affected by woody encroachment. (p. 3 paragraph 4, last sentence) It is unclear what species is referred to by " ... variety of shapes and sizes of trees</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>... " (p. 4, paragraph 3) "structure" is listed twice in item (2). (p. 4, paragraph 3, and p. 24).</p> <p>Under facilitative operations on non-target cover types, the Department believes that to restore ecosystem function within the project area, treatments of non-target cover types should be implemented to maintain desired conditions or move these cover types toward desired conditions. These non-target cover types are contributing to undesirable fire effects, degraded terrestrial and aquatic species habitat, and degraded condition and function of streams and springs within the project area. To exclude these cover types would prevent a comprehensive effort at restoration of ecosystem functions. Furthermore, these facilitative operations may require mechanical treatment, not solely fire. (p. 5) Wet meadows are mentioned only under the Purpose and Need for Streams and Springs. Wet meadows are an integral component of a functioning headwater system.</p> <p>The Department requests that wet meadows are specifically considered under Desired Conditions and Proposed Treatments for aquatic habitats. (p. 5, paragraph 2) The Department requests clarification as to the need to include road decommissioning in the Project, and how the Project would be used to implement Travel Management Rule (TMR) decisions. The PA states there is a need to decommission unneeded routes identified during TMR, however, the PA later (p. 14) gives mileages of roads to be decommissioned for Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests, which have not yet finished TMR. Please provide more information and clarification as to the need and ability for the USFS to make changes to the transportation network outside of TMR. (p. 6, Table 1) The Project analysis area includes >100,000 acres of juniper and pinyon-juniper woodland. Are these within the natural range of variability and meeting desired conditions? If not, why are they excluded from treatment? (p. 8) Savannah types are mentioned in the text, but not included in summary tables. (p. 8, paragraph 4) It is not clear what the percentages of historic incidence of dwarf mistletoe refer to (i.e., infected acreage, stands, or other geographic units?). (pp. 8, 11, 14) Provide criteria for areas classified as being "understocked," and how this fits with overall restoration goals. (p. 9) Define Regional Forester Sensitive species. (p. 11 paragraph 3) Clarify circumstances for which planting would be necessary to meet desired conditions and restoration objections. (pp. 11 - 12) Historically, some areas infected by dwarf mistletoe received intense silvicultural treatments (e.g., "sanitation") that were controversial and compromised aesthetics and</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>wildlife habitat values. Restoration treatments should be done in consideration of the natural incidence of mistletoe and its value to wildlife and habitat.</p> <p>The Department requests that the scale and intensity of mistletoe treatments be more clearly defined. The statement that mitigations will be considered "where more than 20% of ponderosa pine trees or an aggregate of mixed conifer host species are infected" has little meaning without a reference to scale. The same comment applies to the Mechanical Treatment table (p. 24) where the 20% threshold is mentioned again; this may be a very low threshold in areas of low host species diversity. Please clarify or revise to address the discrepancy under differing circumstances. (pp. 16 - 19, Figures 3 - 6) The figures provided by the P A are lacking in context and detail. Given the scale of the Project, we request that USFS publish figures online and include topographic features, so there will be sufficient detail for the public to comment in a meaningful and effective manner. (p. 24) Under Weed and Release, reference is made to thinning where brush, juniper, and evergreen oak species are greater than 40% of the cover.</p> <p>The Department requests clarification on the scale and science/management basis for this number, and that the EIS address the following questions and concerns. Does this proposed thinning only apply to evergreen oaks, 3 and not other oak species? Would this apply only below the Mogollon Rim where evergreen oaks are abundant? The Department requests USFS provide a map of the areas that would be targeted for oak thinning. We anticipate discussions with the ID team to ensure we work towards mutual goals of fuel reduction and wildlife habitat management, given the importance of oaks (including patches of young oak, in some cases) for wildlife. (p. 24) Even-aged shelterwood is a silvicultural system for sustained-yield and of uncertain relevance in a restoration context. The Department requests clarification as to its use and relevance in the Project. There is also a reference to the LTIP/OTIP here, which seems out of context especially given that this is the only reference to these plans within the PA.</p>	
6	<p>Stronger emphasis on aquatic habitat restoration</p> <p>In contrast to the first 4FRI EIS project area, the Rim Country project area contains an extensive aquatic environment. Riparian, wetland, and spring habitats are common in the project area and of tremendous importance to terrestrial and aquatic wildlife. The Department supports active improvement and restoration of these areas, but we are concerned that the P A does not</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>sufficiently emphasize the aquatic restoration opportunities available. The aquatic treatments are confusing and lacking detail on proposed actions and locations. The Department has the following general and specific comments regarding aquatic habitat restoration. (pp. 14 and 26) Define the difference between "riparian stream and stream channel restoration" and "stream habitat restoration." Does this distinction imply perennial versus ephemeral streams?</p> <p>The Department has concerns with the method and accuracy of how riparian habitat was categorized. The "Stream Habitat and Stream Channel" restoration map provided to the Department upon request contains inaccuracies in classifications of streams. The PA does not explain how the 360 miles of stream habitat and 470 miles of non-riparian stream channels were identified. Please provide explanation of stream categorization. The Department would like to provide our expertise on the intermittent, ephemeral, and perennial nature of streams identified within the project area, but is unable to provide comment on the listed mileages without further explanation on methodology and a list of streams and their categories.</p> <p>We fully support the inclusion of restoring function to ephemeral and intermittent stream channels as outlined in the proposed action, and have attached a list of perennial streams (Attachment 1) that we are specifically requesting be included under stream restoration; this list was generated from an Arizona Department of Environmental Quality perennial stream layer. The USFS should consider the streams as the Department's priorities for stream habitat restoration within the Project. The Department requests that all of these streams and reaches be included, and used to calculate the stream restoration mileage. To clarify and simplify stream restoration treatments and locations, the Department requests that the two riparian restoration types identified by the P A be combined into one single restoration type, termed "stream habitat restoration."</p> <p>Per that request, we suggest the following two paragraphs be included under the PA's Purpose and Need to further clarify what constitutes stream habitat restoration within the project area: <i>"Inclusion of stream habitat restoration projects in the project area is an integral part of restoring forest resiliency and ecosystem function. To return streams to functioning condition, 4 incorporation of artificial structures is often the most effective method. High severity wildfire has been shown to negatively impact aquatic habitats and surrounding riparian vegetation and has resulted in decreased habitat complexity, increased water</i></p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p><i>temperatures, and sedimentation, all of which contribute to overall declines in water quality and quantity. Enhancing and restoring aquatic habitat and riparian vegetation would promote the biodiversity of wildlife that inhabit the stream or utilize associated habitats. Incorporation of physical instream structures into broader watershed restoration will improve the overall efficacy of these ecosystem level treatments." "Stream habitat restoration projects in the project area should include instream habitat restoration to improve aquatic species habitat through inclusion of physical structures that would improve habitat heterogeneity." (see Attachment 2, a list of stream habitat restoration activities). (throughout, but specifically pp. 4-5; p. 9, paragraph 4; p. 12, last paragraph) Aquatic habitat restoration under the Project would restore function and provide benefit to all aquatic species.</i></p> <p>The Department therefore requests that the P A remove adjectives that specify that restoration would benefit "sensitive" or "protected" aquatic species; and broaden the benefits of aquatic habitat restoration to include all "aquatic species." (p.5, under Streams and Springs) In some circumstances, barriers are more effective than stream crossings for management activities. The Department requests the USFS work with the Department collaboratively to determine the need for fish passages for specific roads. We request that the sentence be changed to "Reducing road density and improving road and stream crossings (where desirable, and in conjunction with Department management objectives) would maintain natural flow regimes ... " (p. 5, under Streams and Springs)</p> <p>The Department requests inclusion of the sentence: "Instream habitat improvement also stabilizes streamside areas and restores functioning condition in the watershed by decreasing sediment mobilization, maintaining riparian vegetation, and increasing habitat complexity." (p. 7, paragraph 1) Define the methods for the fire model used within the project area. (p.14, last bullet) Change to "Construct up to 200 miles of protective barriers (including jack straw barriers and fencing) around springs, aspen, Bebb's willows, and big-toothed maples, as needed for restoration." (p. 26, under Spring Restoration, Riparian Stream and Stream Channel Restoration, and Stream Habitat Restoration) Please provide more detail on proposed restoration activities for aquatic systems and potential "tools in the toolbox." See Attachment 2 for suggested activities for stream habitat restoration. (p. 26, under Stream Habitat Restoration) Potential structures for stream channel restoration are listed in Attachment 2. Structures would be designed for each stream restoration project to improve the condition of the</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>stream and stabilize the watershed, improving water quality and potentially improving water quantity through reconnection of the stream with the floodplain.</p> <p>5 (p. 26, under Design Features)</p> <p>For aquatic species, the Department would like the EIS to emphasize the following general recommendations to improve aquatic habitat: retain large conifers and/or hardwood trees in riparian corridors; remove encroaching conifers from headwater meadows; and maintain existing/construct new enclosures where ungulate impacts are excessive to restore flow and protect aquatic habitat. (p. 26, under Design Features) To protect watershed health in riparian areas as well as the Rim lakes, which are recreationally and economically important, we request that mutually agreed upon Best Management Practices (BMPs) be developed and implemented before and during treatments, including but not limited to projects that control erosion, minimize soil and ash outputs, and protect riparian areas from siltation during and after mechanical and burn treatments. Refer to the Department's <i>Preliminary Existing Conditions and Habitat Recommendations for the 4FRI Rim Country EIS</i> (Attachment 3), provided to the 4FRI core team in June 2016 for suggested BMPs to protect watershed health.</p>	
7	<p>Broadening of the wildlife focus</p> <p>The PA adequately addresses appropriate treatments for Mexican spotted owl (MSO) and northern goshawk (NOGO). However, we request that the EIS include treatments that create desired conditions for a broader range of wildlife species, not just sensitive or federally protected species. There is no single forest state that maximizes habitat value for all wildlife species, so habitat restoration needs to incorporate spatial heterogeneity, while also considering the requirements of federally protected species. The varying habitat requirements of different species underscores the need for forest restoration practices that are implemented at a sitespecific scale, but applied to the landscape, to improve wildlife populations across the project area. Please refer to Attachment 3 for the Department's specific desired conditions for wildlife habitat based on species distributed within the project area. The Department requests that the uneven-aged group selection (p. 23) to include additional techniques to protect and improve wildlife habitat components, including:</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and promote development of large Gamble oak and other hardwood species • Ensure retention of snags and downed logs • Retain poorly formed, dead-topped, and lightning struck trees <p>The Department requests that mutually agreed upon BMPs (i.e., thinning restrictions) are developed and implemented before and during treatments to minimize negative impacts to terrestrial wildlife from treatments.</p>	
8	<p>Improving wildlife movement across the landscape</p> <p>The Department has identified several activities not included in the PA that would improve or restore wildlife connectivity, movement, and distribution across the landscape. These include creating movement corridors for open canopy species, wildlife water developments or redevelopments, and fence construction or modifications. The Department is pleased with the inclusion of grassland and meadow restoration in the P A, which would benefit pronghorn and other grassland-associated wildlife species. To restore functionality to grasslands and meadows, we anticipate that there may be a need to ensure connectivity between existing grasslands and meadows. The Department supports the need to retain old and large trees and high-canopy patches, and acknowledges that there will be further discussion within the SHG to collaboratively identify the most accurate parameters for identifying the PL Y T areas and the management techniques that will be appropriate therein. However, the Department requests flexibility within PLYT areas to restore intermontane meadow connectivity. As we did during the first 4FRI EIS, the Department will work with the 4FRI core team to identify meadows and grasslands that may require conifer removal, as well as potential corridors that may require thinning to facilitate movement among intermontane meadows and grasslands. Although this flexibility would allow a more intensive treatment in certain PL Y T areas, the Department is not requesting an exception to remove old growth trees.</p> <p>There is a need for up to 36 wildlife water developments or redevelopments within the project area to provide reliable and permanent sources of water in an even distribution across the landscape (Attachment 4). Existing waters in need of redevelopment (n=33) include USFS and Department waters. Examples of potential improvements include the need for creation of an apron, cleaning following sedimentation, damage repair following wildfire, restoring function to old, dilapidated waters, adjustments that improve access for wildlife, and improvements that bring the existing water up to the Department's Wildlife</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Water Construction Standards. Some waters that provide important amphibian habitat may require fencing to exclude livestock, or require restoration following livestock exclusion. New waters can create a more even distribution of wildlife across the landscape and reduce grazing pressure in high use areas. These new waters may be located in areas of importance for particular species or strategically placed to protect habitats of interest from native and nonnative ungulates. Additionally, in areas of aspen recruitment, waters can be placed to strategically pull elk away and facilitate further aspen recruitment.</p> <p>For new and existing wildlife water projects, the Department may have funding or may be interested in partnering with the FS for funding opportunities. There is a need for up to 10 fence constructions or modifications that have been identified within the project area (Attachment 5). New fence projects are needed to exclude livestock and native ungulates from sensitive areas. Fence modifications (i.e., making improvements using the Department's Wildlife Compatible Fencing guidelines) have been identified in the project area to facilitate wildlife movement. These fence modifications will improve landscape permeability for elk, deer, and pronghorn, and in some cases are specific to known spring and fall pronghorn migration, an important ecological component of the ponderosa pine ecosystem. The Department may have funding for such projects, or may be interested in partnering with the FS to seek funding opportunities.</p>	
9	<p>In conclusion, the Department expresses its strong support for the collaborative process being implemented by the 4FRI Project, a one-of-a-kind effort to restore function and resiliency of Arizona's forests, with considerable benefits to terrestrial and aquatic wildlife. We look forward to our continued partnership with USFS on the Rim Country Project.</p>	
Letter 26		Garrett Hanks Trout Unlimited
1	<p>Trout Unlimited (TU) is the nation's largest coldwater conservation organization with over 160,000 members, some 1,800 belonging to Arizona's council of four chapters. Our mission is to protect, conserve, and restore the nation's coldwater fisheries and their watersheds for the next generation. Because these watersheds provide the habitat for outstanding coldwater fisheries and are homes for high quality wildlife populations that are enjoyed by sportsmen/women and recreationists across the West, above all TU is dedicated to protecting and enhancing watersheds. The Four Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI) Rim Country Project (RCP) is an outstanding opportunity to have a long-lasting and widespread positive impact on the landscape, and we are thankful for the</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>opportunity to participate in the planning process. Trout Unlimited supports all the Rim Country Project needs, and hopes to provide input specifically to; improving terrestrial and aquatic species habitat, improving the condition and function of streams and springs; and the restoration of woody riparian vegetation.</p> <p>Some of the most storied and productive coldwater fisheries in Arizona and vital watersources for thousands of people are found within the Rim Country Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) footprint. The project area is home to native Gila trout in conservation populations and recreation settings. We would like to see these resources protected, and we believe that the proposed forest restoration combined with thoughtful hydrologic rehabilitation can produce resilient, sustainable and highly functioning watersheds.</p> <p>Upon review of the 4FRI Rim Country Proposed Action, Trout Unlimited has supplied recommendations to strengthen the subsequent Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and work on the landscape.</p> <p>Two major concerns we would like to see addressed as the Rim Country Project moves forward;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The recommendation that <i>all</i> waterways – perennial, ephemeral, or intermittent – as well as upland dry Trout Unlimited Comments to: 4FRI Rim Country Project Proposed Action 2 drainages, be eligible under the EIS to receive restoration and or improvements and 2) Prioritizing and formalizing evaluation of the hydrologic impacts to streams, aquatic ecosystems, and riparian areas <i>prior</i> to mechanical or fire restoration prescriptions in their watersheds. We feel that using soft infrastructure where needed throughout watersheds, combined with a robust monitoring program to assess impacts from forest restoration prescriptions would lead to the best possible outcome for the 4FRI Rim Country Project watersheds. 	
2	<p>Major Concerns / Topics <i>Eligibility of all waterways to receive restoration and or improvements</i></p> <p>In the Proposed Action on page 14, mileages are identified for stream channels (ephemeral), and stream habitat (perennial). These numbers are presented as the maximum to be evaluated for restoration or other physical work in riparian areas. We believe that it is unnecessary to: identify the maximum total number of miles for restoration, restrict potential locations for restoration, and separate the types of stream classifications and the corresponding restoration techniques. Instead,</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>we recommend that the restoration and improvements on all drainages within the 4FRI Rim Country Project footprint be considered regardless of classification or form of implementation.</p> <p>All drainages have an impact downstream and cumulative effects are greater moving down a watershed. Forest restoration treatments will be watershed wide and landscape scale, and as such, impactful to every collection of water regardless of size. We suggest a blanket approval of hydrologic management across the 4FRI Rim Country Project area, provided that it follows an evaluation for suitability and fits the best management practices and desired project conditions. If strict definitions of stream miles are necessary for the proposed action and subsequent EIS, at a minimum a re-evaluation of the mapping needs to happen. Local knowledge and other mapping efforts do not match the numbers in the Proposed Action, or in Figure 6.</p> <p>Similarly restrictive is the separation between perennial and ephemeral or intermittent streams and the corresponding language of stream habitat and riparian improvements. Because watershed restoration does not fit neatly into these categories, the recommendations for restoration techniques and desired conditions should reflect the diverse ways of meeting the goal for a functioning watershed and waterway. What is good for a stream’s hydrology is good for the fish and other aquatic biota of the riparian corridor. Likewise, restorative changes to dry upland drainages are intended to have the same desired effects of attenuating peak flows in abnormally large events, capturing sediment, promoting vegetative cover, and increasing groundwater infiltration. To separate these categories seems at odds with the rest of 4FRI’s intention to be holistic and multifaceted.</p> <p>If the divide between perennially wet, seasonally flowing, and intermittent streams needs to be in place, the definition needs to be strengthened, as does the reasoning for the split.</p>	
3	<p><i>Evaluating watershed hydrology and aquatic ecology prior to forest treatments</i> Evaluation of hydrologic and ecologic impacts before mechanical or fire treatments is essential to the long-term success of the 4FRI Rim Country Project. As identified on page 26 of the Proposed Action, we strongly agree that hydrologic evaluations and aquatic ecosystem characterization must be done prior to any physical alteration of the landscape. This proactive decision will ensure the long-term health of the entire ecosystem at a watershed level. Trout</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Unlimited is a strong proponent of the proposed landscape level forest restoration; we believe it is the right course for the landscape and its users. By thoroughly evaluating the hydrology and aquatic ecosystems, especially macroinvertebrate assemblages in the drainages to be treated with forest restoration prescriptions, mitigation of potential negative effects and opportunities for positive improvements through adaptive management would be identified.</p> <p>The RCP is full of unique spring fed, bedrock dominated waterways. Their hydrology is largely a product of feast or famine – flood events or spring fed baseflow. And though intrinsically dynamic, these creeks will be greatly impacted by what is done on the land they drain. On one hand, populations of fish like the Gila Trout of Dude Creek could be devastated by a single post burn flood as has happened before. On the other Canyon Creek’s legendary brown trout could benefit from an influx of small gravel sediment in strategic locations, delivered, for example, after a disturbance to the surrounding forest. Knowing the specific hydrology and aquatic biota of each drainage, and what can help or hurt, will ultimately mean the success of Proposed Action’s goals for aquatic systems, but also for the forest restoration prescriptions as a whole.</p> <p>TU believes that upland forest treatments and inchannel restoration can go hand in hand, and that this Proposed Action and 4FRI Rim Country Project is an opportunity to match the proposed forest treatments with similar restoration to the hydrology for a mutually beneficial end. Actions like soft infrastructure channel design, habitat improvement projects, and tributary restoration would possibly offset any negative impacts, but also provide a basis for utilizing the changes to the watershed (from forest operations) for a positive hydrologic effect.</p> <p>Though already identified in the Proposed Action, we would like to see a higher value put on the aquatic and hydrologic evaluations prior to forest management work and acknowledgement of the parallel importance of riparian and inchannel work to compliment the robust effort to restore the Rim Country’s forest ecology.</p>	
4	<p>General Comments <i>Monitoring</i> Monitoring and adaptive management are major components within the first 4FRI Project, however, the Rim Country Project Proposed Action does not</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>define or outline how it would be used in the Rim Country Project. Monitoring of fish and wildlife resources is necessary for determining if restoration activities are effective, and that treatments are managed adaptively to avoid and/or minimize the potential for impacts to species and their habitat. The Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD) has developed Trout Unlimited Comments to: 4FRI Rim Country Project Proposed Action 4 and implemented stream habitat monitoring techniques within the project area. We believe the two agencies should partner with TU to continue to implement the appropriate monitoring techniques.</p> <p>Trout Unlimited promotes and supports citizen science based application of monitoring techniques. Our local membership stands ready to aid the Forest Service in these protocols. We strongly urge the Forest Service to take advantage of these partnerships specifically for stream temperature monitoring and macroinvertebrate sampling. In the past the Arizona council and TU chapters have procured funding to do stream temperature monitoring, and would like to continue as partners in this area.</p> <p>Collaboration and data sharing is crucial to the bottom line of aquatic ecosystem health in the RCP. Projects like the Rocky Mountain Research Station's NorWeST1 are putting together large datasets of stream temperatures which could serve as a host or model for this scenario. Trout Unlimited suggests the creation of a local initiative to work toward a useful stream temperature monitoring program that can engage local partners, provide meaningful scientific contributions to managing agencies, and accumulate the best possible information for the management of the resource.</p> <p>Macroinvertebrates in aquatic ecosystems are well documented indicator species. As a proxy for overall watershed health and a reliable indicator of major disturbance, especially without continuous water quality monitoring, benthic macroinvertebrates should be included in monitoring protocols and partnerships.</p>	
5	<p><i>Socio-economic contributions of sporting tradition</i> Arizona has a rich history of sporting tradition. The Rim Country is widely considered the heart and soul of the coldwater fisheries in the state. In 2015, according to a report by Southwick and Associates², Arizona's first congressional district saw a total of 90,000 anglers, an economic multiplier effect of \$155 million, and supported 1,200 jobs from fishing alone. Like fishing, all forms of traditional sporting recreation are greatly impacted by land</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	management decisions. We hope that the outdoor recreation economy in the RCP area is considered when making decisions for forest treatments.	
6	<p><i>Native species</i> Trout Unlimited has interest in all coldwater fisheries, but would like to highlight the existing populations for native trout recovery efforts in the 4FRI RCP. Conservation of southwest native fish was identified in 2015 as a priority initiative by Trout Unlimited’s strategic plan. Trout Unlimited’s southwest native trout initiative will provide additional focus and funding opportunities for recovery of native trout within the project area. For decades, volunteers and staff have been working in partnership with the Forest Service and Arizona Game and Fish Department among other partners to support the recovery of Apache and Gila trout in their original ranges across the state.</p> <p>Where appropriate, TU supports the pursuit of conservation and recreation populations of native fish in their native ranges. In the case of the RCP, Gila trout exist in small numbers currently, and Apache trout may be of future consideration for reintroduction. TU suggests that any indications of Apache trout found within the EIS analysis area be reported to the recovery team and AZGFD.</p>	
7	<p>Comments to Purpose and Needs <i>Undesirable Fire Effects (p. 4)</i> Trout Unlimited agrees with the need for reduction of potential post fire effects. The Proposed Action identifies that a change in fire regime can help to offset risks, but fails to note that so can properly functioning and healthy streams and riparian areas. We suggest that multiple ways to reduce risk be noted, in this case the complimentary proposed hydrologic restoration.</p>	
8	<p>Comments to Desired Conditions Trout Unlimited generally agrees with the statements in the Desired Conditions section. Specifically, the section about upland treatments providing increased flows downstream and cooler water temperatures we feel should be elaborated on in the Proposed Action and Treatments sections. These types of treatments have been documented by L. M. Norman Et Al. 3 to show positive hydrologic response in similar conditions.</p> <p>Though explained through individual pieces of hydrology, there is not sufficient discussion about overall watershed health in the Desired Conditions. By simply stating that riparian streams need be capable of filtering sediment and transporting bedload, it does not address the need for moving watershed</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>condition and function from non-functioning or at risk designations to properly or highly functioning conditions. As outlined in the Riparian Streams section of 4FRI RCP Proposed Action’s page 9, “<i>Many riparian streams in the Rim Country project area, are currently non-functioning or functioning-at-risk, with accelerated erosion and increased peak flows.</i>” If the goal of the Proposed Action as detailed on page 13 is to, “<i>make the forest more resilient to natural disturbances such as fire, insect and disease, and climate change,</i>” then watershed and riparian health should follow the same logic and would necessitate goals of systems which can handle the immediate impacts of forest restoration treatments but also the larger flood events predicted post burn or in more severe climate change scenarios. This is important not only to wildlife, but also the human communities of the Rim Country.</p> <p>Trout Unlimited would like to highlight the importance of wet meadows in the Rim County landscape. As noted in the Existing Conditions section, page 8, there are places on the forest which have shown meadow function change from wet conditions to dry due to erosive gullies and encroaching trees, causing poor soil condition and loss of vegetative diversity. But most impactful in these scenarios is the loss of water storage high in watersheds⁴. These wet meadow systems are the source of annual baseflow for many waterways of the RCP footprint. These types of impacts are felt hardest in coldwater fisheries, and have serious implications to TU’s organizational concerns. In accordance with those concerns and AZGFD recommendations, we ask for specific direction of wet meadow restoration in the Desired Conditions and Proposed Treatments.</p>	
9	<p>Comments to Proposed Action</p> <p>As referenced in the Main Arguments section of this document, the language around the Proposed Action’s definition of riparian vs non-riparian is confusing and sometimes incorrect. Footnoted number 3 on page 14 states that ephemeral and intermittent streams do not have perennial groundwater or riparian vegetation. Trout Unlimited cautions against this distinction. Though we understand the desire to separate dry, upland drainages and lower lying wetter sites, information produced by this attempted distinction is incorrect in Figure 6.</p> <p>In many of the streams defined as non-riparian on and below the rim there is typically year round groundwater, sufficient to support riparian vegetation. These riparian zones, although not used by fish year round, do provide corridors of migration during high flow events, are suitable habitat for many other species,</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>and regardless of definition an important part of watershed and overall health of a stream⁵.</p> <p>Furthermore, these dry sections of otherwise ephemeral waterways will possibly see a positive influx of water post forest restoration. If so, the definitions of certain stream segments as laid out in the Proposed Action could possibly change during the lifespan of the EIS or the Forest Plans. It could be argued that to restore function to those non-riparian reaches would be to rewet them in some cases. Would the accomplishment of that goal remove them from the eligibility to do continued work on systems whose condition could still be improved? Because they should receive the same level of evaluation, and similar potential physical work, we would prefer all stream channels be treated similarly and more simply defined.</p> <p>Trout Unlimited recognizes the differences between the upland dry drainages and the typical riparian corridors of the RCP footprint. However, we feel that putting a maximum length definition on the mitigation across the footprint, could lead to undesirable outcomes for overall stream health and aquatic wildlife communities.</p>	
10	<p>Proposed Treatments <i>Grassland and meadow restoration (p. 25)</i></p> <p>Not mentioned in the Proposed Treatment section is language specific to wet meadows. As mentioned above, these hydrologic features can have extremely important impacts to overall watershed and aquatic ecosystem health. In the subsequent DEIS, Trout Unlimited suggests the Forest Service identifies candidates and recommends management for the restoration and rewetting of historically wet meadows in the RCP landscape.</p> <p>Trout Unlimited has been a partner on previous wet meadow restoration projects in the southwest. Similar techniques as listed by the Forest Service for upland erosion control can be used to restore the function of historically wet meadows, and in conjunction the watersheds they support. Please refer to the <i>Characterization and Restoration of Slope Wetlands in New Mexico</i> 6 for more information about these techniques.</p>	
11	<p><i>Riparian Stream and Stream Channel Restoration and Stream Habitat Restoration (p. 26)</i></p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Trout Unlimited agrees that restoration is needed to restore watershed and stream function, but would like to add that both improvements to current conditions and increasing overall resiliency are of equal merit when evaluating potential future impacts to the watersheds of the RCP. Again, we stress the need for identification of overall watershed condition prior to specific treatment decisions for mechanical and fire forest treatments. Likewise, we see the Proposed Treatments for stream habitat and riparian and stream channel restoration to be very similar, and would likely use the same techniques to address both concerns.</p> <p>We applaud the Forest’s direction to emphasize soft infrastructure rather than structural. To best accomplish restoration of streams and drainages, we suggest examples of non-structural treatments be added with the other possible treatments listed, to a “toolbox” of approved Design Features, while still allowing for adaptive and creative solutions for situational prescriptions.</p>	
12	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>In a testimony to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Trout Unlimited CEO Chris Wood reflected that, “The guiding principle of the federal government’s action regarding wildfire—and all other management activities— should be to ensure the long-term ecological health of the lands and waters upon which we all depend.”⁷ The Four Forest Restoration Initiative and the Rim Country Project have an opportunity to accomplish a broad set of goals and directives. Trout Unlimited applauds the vision of these projects, and hopes our contributions to that vision are helpful. We are thankful to participate in the public input process for these important projects and decisions.</p> <p>Though we believe that the forest restoration of the Rim Country is necessary and we trust in the process to guide that management, our goal is to see more importance put on the hydrology and aquatic ecosystems in the footprint, as you cannot have a healthy watershed without the cumulative health of the uplands and the waterways. Chris Wood also reminded the Senate Committee that Forest Service road and fish habitat projects have dropped from 250 to 40 in recent years, and that in 2015 alone watershed restoration projects were reduced by 35%. Trout Unlimited hopes this project will buck that trend.</p>	
Letter 27		<p>Stephen M. Dewhurst, School of Forestry, Northern Arizona University</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
1	<p>In general the Proposed Action (PA), has more general statements than substance. The document could be improved by adding detail to the description of the project and its scope. It is nice to state that the project will accomplish objectives like increased forest resiliency, but it is more important to capture what that means and how that will be accomplished, with enough detail to allow the public to make meaningful comments. I would like to know what a ‘resilient’ forest will look like compared to how it looks now. What are the metrics, the ranges of conditions, and the percentages of the landscape that will receive those specific modifications? Also it would be good to connect the content of the different sections; the topics discussed in each section (Purpose & Need, Existing Conditions, and Desired Conditions) should be the same, but there are different topics discussed in some but not others (i.e. cultural resources).</p>	
2	<p>Under Purpose and Need;</p> <p>a. The second paragraph on page 2 states “The purpose of the project is to reestablish and restore forest structure and pattern... To conditions within the natural range of variation,” but there is not a section in the document that adequately describes the natural range of variation (NRV) for the project area.</p>	
3	<p>Forest Service Manual (FSM) 2020 is referenced but this document does not adequately capture the direction and/or intent of FSM 2020 as it relates and guides this project. Adding this direction and information on the NRV would help the reader understand the purpose and need for this project. (From FSM 2020 - “In order to construct a desired future condition for an area, one should assess past and current conditions as well as how these conditions may change into the future.” And “The desired future condition of an ecosystem should be informed by an assessment of spatial and temporal variation in ecosystem characteristics under historic disturbance regimes during a specified reference period.”)</p>	
4	<p>In the fourth paragraph on page 2 there is a statement about how the Forest Plans will “define” how the forest will be moved toward NRV but there is no information on how NRV and the Forest Plans are connected (if they are). It would be good to add some information to help the reader understand the difference between the purpose of the project being reestablishing conditions within NRV and the need to follow the Forest Plans. It would also be good to explain the difference in the Forest Plans and the revisions of those plans and how those differences will manifest themselves across the project area (one plan is new, one has been released as a draft and the Tonto plan is just starting revision, with the existing plan having minimal direction).</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
5	<p>The descriptions of the different headings is more about general statements (i.e. “reduce the risk of undesirable fire behavior” “improve the condition of..”) than specific description of what the project need really is. As an example (fire); since you mentioned the purpose was to return to NRV, what was the fire behavior under NRV? The document would be stronger if the purpose statements were connected to NRV information. It would also help the reader understand the difference between what the current conditions are now and what the desired conditions are, especially if specific metrics and descriptors are being used consistently.</p> <p>For example fire risk can be defined by fire behavior (low intensity surface fire – a component of NRV for frequent fire ecological systems), which can be defined by forest conditions (tons of coarse woody debris, tree density, ladder fuels, crown density and connectivity, etc.), all of which can be assigned historical (NRV), current, and desired, condition quantifiers. Then you can describe the need (NEPA direction) as the difference between existing and desired. For example there is a need to reduce coarse woody debris across the project area (or within a specific habitat type) from 15-25 tons per acre (existing) to 3-10 tons per acre (from Forest Plan which corresponds with NRV). This detail provides a better understanding of what the need really is (you need to remove 12-15 tons per acre).</p>	
6	<p>Under the section titled Terrestrial and Aquatic Species Habitat, there is a statement “There is a need to retain as many old large trees as possible”. This needs to be clarified; ‘as possible’ is based on what? What is an ‘old large tree’? Without definition and clarification how will you know if you have meet this? Without more information how will the public know how this will shape the forest?</p>	
7	<p>3. Under Existing Conditions</p> <p>a. This section provides some existing condition information, but only a few (Table 2 only covers three metrics) of the many that are connected to the different treatment needs (grasslands, riparian areas, different forest types, etc.). As stated above it would be beneficial to look at the existing condition information along with both the NRV (historical), and desired condition, by resource or management need. For example under Terrestrial and Aquatic Species Habitat there is a snag element which can be described for historical, current and desired conditions. This format would be more comprehensive and easier to assimilate as a reader. Also it would allow for the display of more desired conditions.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Table 2 has a difference in metric display; the existing condition information for basal area and trees per acre is one number but the metric for desired condition information for these two descriptors is displayed as a range, they should be the same either as a range or an average (the chart heading says average).</p> <p>Tables 3&4 do not provide descriptions for passive and active crown fire. There is no definition of what ‘no fire’ means. The components that support fire behavior like fuel loading (coarse woody debris), crown bulk density, ladder fuel, interspaces (canopy breaks), and canopy base heights are not included. What are those elements you need to change and how do compare with existing conditions and desired conditions.</p> <p>Tables 3&4 do not provide descriptions for passive and active crown fire. There is no definition of what ‘no fire’ means. The components that support fire behavior like fuel loading (coarse woody debris), crown bulk density, ladder fuel, interspaces (canopy breaks), and canopy base heights are not included. What are those elements you need to change and how do compare with existing conditions and desired conditions.</p> <p>There are discussions of existing conditions that were not previously discussed under the purpose and need section, like acres of understocked forest lands. Again, by jointly describing the existing conditions and desired conditions and then establishing the project need the complete purpose of the project can be displayed. This comment applies to the discussion of grasslands, savannas, and meadows, as well.</p> <p>Some of the discussion is just general information and does not include information on existing condition (the discussion of the 360 miles of fish-bearing streams). Some of the existing condition discussion is not linked to desired conditions so there is no indication of what the need for change is and what elements need to be changed (the discussion of springs and riparian streams). As a result it is difficult to comprehend what management needs will be incorporated into the proposed action (are all of the riparian areas on all the forests going to be addressed or just some parts?). The discussion of existing conditions should be tied to the discussion of purpose and need and should be written so they define the scope of the proposed action.</p>	
8	Under Desired Condition	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>a. This section does not mesh with the other two sections; that is the discussion points put forth in the purpose and need do not logically flow through the sections on existing and desired conditions. As a result there is no clear comparison of the metrics that define the need for change discussion points.</p> <p>b. The table 7 information was already displayed and should be removed.</p> <p>c. In the second to last paragraph there is mention that many of the understocked areas are not suitable for planting; this is not desired condition information. This information should be included under the existing condition write-up and the amount of acres that are suitable should be included if this project proposal includes the planting of these acres. At the end of this paragraph it states planting, burning, and other management actions will ‘be considered’, since this is a site specific analysis the plan to project analysis should have determined what management actions will be incorporated into the proposed action and those actions should be described here specifically not as a speculative, possible, action. Also this is not desired condition information – more purposed and need discussion.</p> <p>d. The desired condition statements should be linked (referenced) to the Forest Plans, since that should be the origin. I realize that there are different plans with different levels of revision but still, if the Forest Plans are driving the project (which they are), the DC statements should be from the plans not from general conclusions. By linking the plans the associated environmental analysis can be incorporated by reference.</p> <p>e. A lot of the paragraphs in this section are composed of general statements, which aren’t really desired condition statements. Also only bits and pieces of the desired conditions for the resource areas (like wetlands) are described it would be easier to just cut and paste in the Dc statements from the plans, i.e.;</p> <p><i>Desired Conditions for Wetlands/Cienegas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetland conditions are consistent with their flood regime and flood potential. • Native plant and animal species that require wetland habitats have healthy populations within the natural constraints of the particular wetland community. • Wetlands infiltrate water, recycle nutrients, resist erosion, and function properly. (From the Kaibab plan) 	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>The last paragraph in this section describes some effects; “any negative effects on these species from management actions will be mitigated and plant numbers will remain the same”. Where the heading for this section is Desired Conditions any discussion of effects should be removed. This section should be specific to the desired conditions as captured in the Forest Plans, and closely linked to those different vegetative or ecological components that are associated with the restoration plans of the project.</p>	
9	<p>5. Under Proposed Action/Proposed treatments</p> <p>a. This section lacks information that would help the reader/interested public fully understand the scope of the project – again this is a site specific analysis, not a programmatic document. Whereas it is difficult to talk to thousands of acres, the scoping process as I interoperate it under the NEPA legislation and the FSM and FSH direction directs the scoping process to be specific. Some examples;</p> <p>i. Mechanically thin trees – to what end will you ‘thin trees’? What will be the residual density, density ranges, and where would those ranges be applied and why? What other treatment components would be include in the ‘tree thinning’? Like spatial arrangement, canopy gaps (interspaces), diameter/age distribution, and where and why that treatment would be applied. Without this information how can you expect to get meaningful comments? When you say were going to make the forest great again and nothing more you can’t expect to get a consistent understanding from stake holders as what the forest will look like and what the expected effects will be. The treatment description has some information (thin to a BA of 30-80 in ponderosa pine) but it does not describe where and why you would thin to a BA of 30 vs a BA of 80, nor does it describe how much heterogeneity would be applied (post treatment how much of the area would be treated to a BA of 30)? The same comments would be applied to the 10%-90% interspaces – Where and why would you create 30% of the area as interspace vs 70% let say?</p> <p>ii. Conduct facilitative operations – what is this? Need to have a definition for this term – the reader does not know if this applies to roads, trees, recreation facilities or what! What are you facilitating? This statement is followed by parenthesis capturing thinning and burning, is there more? If it is thinning and</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>burning, then the above comments should be considered in describing the activities.</p> <p>Planting, burning, and other activities to encourage reforestation - Need more detail; how many acres are going to be planted and where? What are the “other activities”? Remember this is a site specific analysis, not a programmatic document.</p> <p>iv. There are similar general statements for the other bullets (Improve, relocate and reconstruct roads, restore function of riparian areas, restore hydrologic function). It is great that you are going to do all this good restoration work but how are you going to do it? Are you going to use mechanical equipment, do seeding, planting, or just what and where are you doing this (the maps show stream locations, meadows and such but does that mean that the entire length or entire meadow is going to be treated)? Since this is a ‘scoping document’ there needs to be enough information to convey the scope of the project so that meaningful comments can be made.</p> <p>There is no mention or link, to how, or even if, NRV will be incorporated into the proposed action (other than the initial sentence at the beginning of the proposed action). There is also no general information about NRV as it might relate to this project, in contradiction to the new FSM 2020 direction. For example, tree planting: if NRV was specific to certain spatial patterns, would you still plant trees on a fixed DXD spacing or would you incorporate some other requirements to re-stock unforested areas in a more “natural” configuration?</p>	
10	<p>Under Possible Alternatives</p> <p>a. Since the desired conditions in Tables 2 and 7 are specified in terms of a range of values, it must be ensured that the range of alternatives is sufficient to demonstrate the difference in effects between managing at the low versus the high side of the range.</p> <p>b. At least 1 alternative which analyzes the impact of returning the forest to a state closely approximating historic reference conditions, and which incorporates an aggressive strategy to achieve the stated goal of comprehensive landscape restoration (as stated in the Introduction) while complying with requirements such as the Endangered Species Act is essential. What would comprehensive</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>landscape restoration look like? How soon could we get there? How does that compare to the proposed action? Why is it inconsistent with the forest plans?</p> <p>c. Decades and millions of dollars have been spent on scientific research into historic forest conditions and the ecological consequences of management actions. This document appears to be almost devoid of science, and a science-based alternative is required to understand how the compromises and simplifications built into this document either are, or are not, consistent with the best available science.</p>	
Letter 28		<p>Travis Bruner Arizona Forests Program Manager Grand Canyon Trust</p>
1	<p>The Grand Canyon Trust (“GCT” or the “Trust”) strongly supports the desire of the Forest Service (“USFS”) to reestablish the resilience and function of northern Arizona’s ponderosa pine and mixed conifer ecosystems and commends it on taking monumental steps towards achieving this goal. We believe it is vital that forest structure be restored to these ecosystems, thereby allowing for the reintroduction of fire into wildland forests in a way that is safe, acceptable to local communities, and protective of wildlife and native biological diversity. To be successful, GCT believes that restoration efforts must be ecologically, economically, and socially viable.</p> <p>On June 21, 2016, through correspondence, the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, and Tonto National Forests released a proposal to conduct restoration activities within a 1.24 million acres of ponderosa pine ecosystem over approximately 10 years (the “Rim Country Project” or the “Project”). This correspondence included a brief description of the Purpose and Need and Proposed Action for the Rim Country Project. On June 27, 2016, the U.S. Forest Service (“USFS”) published a Notice of Intent (“NOI”) to prepare an environmental impact statement for the Project in the Federal Register, at 81 Fed. Reg. 41517, which included a description of the Purpose and Need and Proposed Action. The Proposed Action for the Project would implement treatments – mechanized operations to cut trees and prescribed burns to maintain desired openings and interspaces, between trees – across the Mogollon Rim and Red Rock Ranger Districts of the Coconino National Forest, the Black Mesa and Lakeside Districts of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest, and the Payson and Pleasant Valley Districts of the Tonto National Forest.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>The Trust respectfully submits these comments on the Proposed Action and the scope of analysis to be conducted in the environmental impact statement. The Trust is a nonprofit organization that focuses on the protection and restoration of the Colorado Plateau – its spectacular landscapes, flowing rivers, clean air, diversity of plants and animals, and areas of beauty and solitude. Since 2009, the Trust has been an active member of the Four Forest Restoration Initiative (“4FRI”) Stakeholder Group (the “Stakeholder Group”), a collaborative group of more than 30 organizations, municipalities, institutions, and agencies focused on carrying out landscape-scale forest restoration efforts across 2.4 million acres of the Mogollon Rim in northern Arizona, including the Project area. GCT staff and members regularly use and enjoy areas of the National Forests within the Project area.</p>	
2	<p>The Trust believes that the Proposed Action provides a general framework for accomplishing successful forest restoration efforts. However, the Trust encourages USFS to elaborate and refine its plan for forest restoration activities by completing a revised Proposed Action prior to beginning its analysis of the Proposed Action. Specifically, GCT respectfully requests that the USFS develop a revised Proposed Action that includes further discussion regarding: (1) forest structure modification, (2) large and old growth trees, (3) livestock grazing, (4) springs, streams, and riparian areas, and (5) monitoring and adaptive management.</p>	
3	<p>A. Forest Structure Modification The Proposed Action proposes nine different mechanical treatment approaches. While the descriptions of these various mechanical treatment types provide a useful overview of treatment approaches, the Trust suggests that the USFS revise its Proposed Action by providing a more detailed explanation of how treatments would modify the structural and spatial characteristics of remaining forest cover. For example, the uneven-aged group selection treatment proposes thinning to 20-80 square feet of basal area with interspaces over 10-90% of the stand in Ponderosa Pine, Ponderosa Pine-Gambel Oak, Ponderosa Pine-Evergreen Oak and thinning to 30-100 square feet of basal area with interspaces adjacent to groups in Dry Mixed Conifer. Here, the ranges for uneven-aged group selection should be somewhat narrowed. The approach presented in the Final Refined Proposed Action for the 1st 4FRI EIS in 2011 provides helpful guidance, aiming for thinning to 50-70 square feet of basal area while interspaces should be more specific and correlate to site quality. The Trust believes that further knowledge about the structural and spatial characteristics of the remaining forest cover</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>would provide the public with a better understanding of the result of mechanical treatments and allow for a more comprehensive analysis of the effects of mechanical treatments on wildlife populations, ecosystem processes, and community uses of the landscape.</p> <p>The Trust is concerned about the Proposed Action’s conception of the role of dwarf mistletoe in the Project area. The occurrence of dwarf mistletoe in ponderosa pine is a natural phenomenon. In a healthy ponderosa pine forest, dwarf mistletoe will occur at a natural level. Indeed, fossil records show that dwarf mistletoes have been around for 40 million years or more, likely providing multiple ecological services.¹ Where dwarf mistletoe occurs at unnaturally high levels, it is likely the symptom of other forest health issues. Thus, the Trust suggests that dwarf mistletoe mitigation be removed from the list of potential treatments, that where it occurs at natural levels it be allowed to remain unaddressed by treatments, and that where it occurs at unnaturally high levels that USFS consider addressing other forest health issues rather than mitigating dwarf mistletoe directly through thinning.</p>	
4	<p>Aspen are dying and declining within the Project area and the Proposed Action contemplates the use of barriers to reduce ungulate browsing. GCT supports the use of protective fencing and barriers in these instances to protect aspen clones from ungulate browsing, we also support addressing the root causes of over-browsing in these areas.</p>	
5	<p>B. Large & Old Growth Trees</p> <p>The Trust appreciates that USFS states that there is a need to “retain as many old and large trees as possible and “maintain and promote the development of old growth characteristics and components.” However, GCT is concerned that these aspirational statements do not provide sufficient clarity or assurances regarding protection and retention of old growth and large trees.</p> <p>During the first 4FRI EIS planning process, the Stakeholder Group collaboratively developed an Old Growth Protection and Large Tree Retention Strategy (OGP/LTRS). This document reflects agreement between a diverse group of environmental conservation organizations, scientists, agencies, and industry representatives on how to protect old growth trees and retain large trees during implementation of restoration treatments. The document identifies the actions that should be taken to protect and retain large trees in many situations that would be encountered during the implementation of the Rim Country</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Project. The Trust believes that OGP/LTRS should be referenced in the Proposed Action and incorporated into the DEIS and FEIS.</p> <p>The old tree implementation plan (OTIP) and modified large tree implementation plan (MLTIP), presented in the 1st 4FRI FEIS at Appendix D, Sections C and D, also provide clear direction on the protection and retention of old-growth and large trees. While the Rim Country Project area contains a more complex vegetative community than the first 4FRI project area, with a higher incidence of mixed conifer stands, the approaches described in OTIP and MLTIP remain relevant and we urge the USFS to revise the Proposed Action to clearly state that those plans will be strongly considered for this Project. The Trust suggest that OTIP and MLTIP be referenced in the Proposed Action and incorporated into the DEIS and FEIS.</p> <p>Additionally, we request that USFS strongly consider forthcoming stakeholder group recommendations regarding criteria for identifying areas with a preponderance of large young trees and management strategies within those areas. This will greatly enhance the social acceptability, ecological appropriateness, and overall success of the Project.</p>	
6	<p>C. Livestock Grazing</p> <p>The Trust appreciates that one of the resource management topics that USFS plans to address within the Rim Country Project area is the management of livestock grazing. All members of the public have an interest in retaining the ecological benefits of forest restoration while minimizing the potential for unintended losses due to livestock overgrazing. Proactive planning regarding livestock grazing locations, rotations, and utilization levels will help protect the healthy understory of grasses and forbs that return after restoration.</p> <p>On grazing allotments where thinning and/or burning will occur, GCT suggests that USFS and permittees coordinate together to adjust rotation schedules and ensure that livestock move away from those pastures where thinning and burning operations occur for at least two years post-treatment. Developing such a plan is essential to the success of restoration treatments and the safety of livestock. It will also provide clarity to livestock permittees, enabling them to adjust their operations in a manner that suits their needs during the treatment period.</p> <p>The Proposed Action discusses management strategies to restore streams, riparian areas, and springs. These resources are essential to the maintenance of</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>biodiversity, provide essential water and forage for wildlife, and fill countless other niches of ecological importance. These areas are also historically important for livestock grazing within the Project area. GCT suggests that USFS consider developing a plan for livestock management that protects streams, riparian areas, and springs in a manner that will increase the resilience of those areas for all uses over the long-term. Such a plan would be particularly useful for those sites that are prioritized for restoration through a systematic approach as suggested in the next comment section.</p> <p>In the wake of restorative thinning and burning projects, understory conditions will improve. Maintaining resultant increases in biodiversity, grass and forb production, and general resilience of the ecosystem will be high priorities for USFS and the public. The Trust suggests the identification of long-term strategies to retain improved understory conditions resultant from restoration treatments, and those strategies should include consideration of how to best to manage livestock grazing over the long-term within the Project area.</p>	
7	<p>D. Springs, Streams, and Riparian Areas The Proposed Action recognizes the importance of protecting riparian areas, stream channels, and springs within the Rim Country Project area. Conserving these water sources is even more essential in the age of climate change. Considering that 867 of the 1243 miles of stream in the planning area are non-functioning or functioning-at-risk and approximately 184 springs show downward trends or static-degraded conditions, the Trust suggests developing a systematic approach to the identification of and prioritization of restoration needs in these areas.</p> <p>Prioritization of these restoration sites would be best developed through a collaborative process where the Stakeholder Group engages in a discussion to balance site condition, importance to aquatic and terrestrial wildlife, recreation value, and other factors. GCT supports the use of protective fencing and barriers to exclude grazing ungulates and removal of trees as appropriate when complimented by addressing root causes of overall degradation.</p>	
8	<p>E. Monitoring and Adaptive Management A monitoring and adaptive management plan is integral to any restoration project, especially for a project of this scale. Potential impacts to fish, wildlife, and recreation must be measured in order to understand the effectiveness of restoration treatments and communicate useful information about those treatments to the public. While some specifics regarding Mexican spotted owl</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>and northern goshawk habitat requirements are addressed, very little detail is provided regarding other fish and wildlife species. The Trust suggests that USFS provide more detail about the impacts of restoration treatments on the habitats of aquatic and terrestrial species, how those impacts will be monitored, and what adaptive management actions will be taken to reduce potential negative impacts on the habitats of those species.</p>	
9	<p>The Trust appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Action. We believe that the completion of a revised Proposed Action that includes the elaborations and refinements discussed above will help USFS conduct an environmental impact statement for forest restoration activities that garners support among the 4FRI stakeholder group as well as local and regional communities.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
Letter 29		Gentry Smith, President Desert Fly Casters
1	<p>The Desert Fly Casters club is a long time non-profit representing fly fishers in the Phoenix metropolitan area and throughout Arizona. Our mission is to advance the sport of fly fishing in Arizona through education, conservation and community outreach including by: Committing to conserve, restore and enhance local and regional fisheries.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on the 4FRI Rim Country Project EIS Proposed Action. We have worked for many years on many conservation projects in the state with the Arizona Game and Fish Department, the White Mountain Lakes Foundation, Trout Unlimited and other fly fishing organizations in the state. We are an International Federation of Fly Fishers affiliate.</p> <p>We have reviewed the June 2016 Proposed Action and support the objective of the Rim Country Proposed Action “to reestablish and restore forest structure, ... forest health, ... and diversity ... , thus moving the project area toward the desired conditions.” We further support the Purposes and Needs stated for the Proposed Action, especially to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase forest resiliency and sustainability; - Reduce risk of undesirable fire effects; - Improve terrestrial and aquatic species habitat; - Improve the condition and function of streams and springs; and 	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
2	<p>- Restore woody riparian vegetation.</p> <p>We are also familiar with and in support of comments being submitted by the Arizona Trout Unlimited organization, and we routinely receive briefing reports from the Arizona Game and Fish Department such as on their Coldwater Fisheries Management Program now being deployed throughout the state. Therefore we support the fisheries management related comments now being made by AZGFD on the Rim Country EIS.</p> <p>The Desert Fly Casters have special interest in the fisheries and fishing opportunities in the Rim Country Project area; We routinely visit both the streams and lakes included in that footprint, and indeed have long been part, both as an organization and through individual members' activities, of conservation efforts and stream restoration initiatives there. A particular example is Canyon Creek in the Tonto NF, where our on-stream efforts go back many years and continue today. In accord with those interests we would like to emphasize the importance of the following in the analysis and planning for the EIS:</p>	
3	<p>Stream Restoration</p> <p>The numerous streams in the project that both support some of the most productive trout fisheries in the state and contribute to Arizona's vital water supplies. The proposed forest restoration combined with thoughtful hydrologic rehabilitation on those streams can produce resilient, sustainable and highly functioning watersheds that support both native and recreational fisheries. All perennial, ephemeral, or intermittent streams (not just those identified in Figure 6, page 19 of the PA) should be eligible under the EIS to receive restoration and/or improvements, if needed. All drainages can have an impact downstream and cumulative effects can be much greater moving down a watershed. Forest restoration treatments will be watershed wide and landscape scale, and as such, impact every collection of water regardless of size. Not all streams may need restoration or special treatment, but the EIS should provide the necessary compliance, through a flexible "Toolbox" approach, if restoration or special treatment is deemed appropriate. Prior to mechanical or fire restoration treatments, the potential hydrologic impacts of those treatment to streams, aquatic ecosystems, and riparian areas should be formally evaluated. Treatments should be adjusted to avoid or mitigate potential adverse impacts.</p>	
4	<p>Characterization of Stream Hydrologic Conditions and Aquatic Populations / Conditions</p> <p>Monitoring of fisheries and wildlife resources both pre- and post-restoration is necessary for determining if restoration activities are effective, and that</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>treatments are managed adaptively to avoid and/or minimize the potential for negative impacts to wildlife and/or the habitats. Aquatic habitat monitoring is particularly critical to ensure treatments are not resulting in long-term negative impacts to watershed health. The Rim Country Proposed Action should be amended to recognize the needs for pre- and post-treatment monitoring and to describe how it will be used in the project. We especially ask for the identification and characterization of the aquatic invertebrates (the “food-base”) in all candidate streams, and also the stream temperature profiles. These measures will best allow for good planning and for the application of adaptive management practices.</p>	
Letter 30		<p>Alicyn Gitlin Sierra Club Grand Canyon Chapter</p>
1	<p>This letter provides scoping comments from Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter on the “Rim Country Proposed Action” (PA) for the Four Forests Restoration Initiative (4FRI). This comment is timely because the Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on June 27, 2016, with a 45 day comment period ending August 11, 2016.</p> <p>The Sierra Club’s mission is “to explore, enjoy, and protect the wild places of the earth; to practice and promote the responsible use of the earth’s ecosystems and resources; and to educate and enlist humanity to protect and restore the quality of the natural and human environments.” Inspired by nature, the Sierra Club’s more than 1.3 million members and supporters work together to protect our communities and the planet. Sierra Club has regularly participated in stakeholder meetings since 2010 and protection of the region’s forests and wildlife is a high priority for our membership in Arizona. Our members have a significant interest in this proposed action as we have been very involved in protection of Arizona’s public lands and the wildlife that depend on them.</p> <p>We support the need for forest restoration to protect wildlife habitat, watersheds, forest resiliency, and ecosystem function. Our members believe that ecological values should always take priority over economic gain when treating our forests.</p> <p>Bad logging practices during the last century removed most of the large trees and old growth from Arizona’s landscape, while overgrazing eliminated much of the dense grasses and forbs from the understory. These factors along with fire suppression resulted in a crop of small, overly dense trees with an increased fire</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>hazard across the landscape. While it is important to thin these dense stands, it is of paramount importance that we protect the limited remaining large and old growth trees to protect the wildlife that depend on them, including species such as the northern goshawk.</p> <p>Because most trees remaining in the project area are small, we want to make sure that large and old trees are protected, and that enough acres of closed canopy habitat remain to ensure survival of species that rely on mature forest structure. The goal of 4FRI must be ecological restoration above all else, including retaining old growth and large trees, and the return of natural fire processes to the landscape. Only through careful implementation and proper monitoring will we be able to achieve that goal.</p> <p>In preparation of the 4FRI Rim Country Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the Forest Service should take into consideration the following:</p>	
2	<p>ALL EXISTING OLD GROWTH AND “PRE-SETTLEMENT” TREES SHOULD BE PROTECTED</p> <p>The proposed action should prohibit old growth logging consistent with the stakeholders’ Old Growth Protection and Large Tree Retention Strategy, developed for the first 4FRI EIS. The proposed action should not allow for logging old growth and “presettlement” trees—trees that established prior to the disruption of natural fire regimes. Old growth patches and presettlement trees should be retained in all cases, regardless of tree size.</p> <p>The only way to restore and develop old growth as a natural process at the landscape scale is to preserve the old growth components that currently exist. This can best be accomplished by retaining old growth components such as yellow pines and large trees at the individual and group levels while identifying stands that as a whole generally exhibit old growth characteristics. The goal is to provide as much old growth as can be sustained in patterns that provide for a flow of functions and interactions at multiple scales across the landscape through time. While old growth is a term generally used to describe ecosystem function, it is also increasingly used by the public, academics and even some land managers to describe individual trees with the characteristics described below in "A."</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>(A) Retain old growth trees regardless of size, as old growth is a function of age, not size. Old growth is not a definitive age. Ponderosa pines begin to develop the thick yellow bark characteristic of an old growth tree between 120 and 150 years of age. As they age, the yellow-red bark also develops wide, large plates. In addition to bark characteristics, an old growth ponderosa pine tree typically exhibits complex structural attributes such as full crowns, flattened tops and large limbs. These trees are sometimes referred to as yellow pines, presettlement trees or mature trees. (Note that “The Path Forward” dated March 19, 2010, a document guiding the Four Forests Restoration Initiative uses the following language: “8.No old growth trees (predating Euro-American settlement) shall be cut.”)</p> <p>(B)When creating openings, protect old growth trees by removing excess competition from small, young trees. Initially, removal should focus on, but not be restricted to, trees 12 inches in diameter and smaller. Such a focus is warranted given the high density and high percentage of the forest landscape these trees occupy. According to the USDA, more than 82 percent of ponderosa pine trees in Region Three are smaller than 11 inches in diameter¹². Thinning should occur within groups, as well as in identified openings between groups.</p> <p>(C) Reduce the fire risk to old growth trees by removing small, younger trees, as well as some mid-aged trees, (VSS 4: 12 to 18 dbh) from within the drip lines of individual trees. Given the lack of trees larger than 16 inches in diameter, thinning should focus on trees smaller than 16 inches in diameter. Approximately 96 percent of the trees in Region Three are smaller than 15 inches in diameter³⁴. This would reduce ladder fuels, lowering the potential for crown fires. It would also encourage the growth of an understory community.</p> <p>(D)When developing future old growth stands and managing for mature age classes, larger diameter trees, in VSS 4, 5 and 6 should be retained to replace the structure and function of old growth trees that were removed by logging.</p> <p>(E) To provide for an uneven age structure, within old growth stands, retain groups of young and mid-aged trees to provide for multiple age classes and enhance structural diversity. Thin variably within retained groups, removing ladder fuels and avoiding even spacing.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>(F) Identify and retain areas that would be best left unthinned as wildlife cover and for travel corridors.</p> <p>(G) Preserve all snags. Downed logs with a diameter greater than 10" will be preserved.</p> <p>(H) Use prescribed fire and the management of natural ignitions to reduce ground fuels and to reintroduce fire to the ecosystem.</p> <p>(I) Defer Livestock grazing, after the initial fire treatment to allow for understory recovery and change grazing management to allow for function of natural processes.</p> <p>(J) Decrease road densities to enhance stand integrity by reclaiming old skid trails and log landings.</p>	
3	<p>THE STAKEHOLDER LARGE-TREE RETENTION STRATEGY SHOULD FORM THE BASIS OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</p> <p>The Forest Service should include the Large Tree Retention Strategy, developed for the first 4FRI EIS, as a basis for the proposed action; the Forest Service has the authority to include the Large Tree Retention Strategy as a basis of a preferred alternative in the EIS. The Large Tree Retention Strategy should be implemented and honored in the Rim Country EIS.</p>	
4	<p>THE EIS SHOULD DESCRIBE THE AFFIRMATIVE GOAL OF SAFELY RESTORING NATURAL FIRE REGIMES AND HOW STRATEGICALLY PLACED TREATMENTS DEPLOYED WITHIN FIRESCAPES WILL FACILITATE THE MANAGEMENT OF PLANNED AND UNPLANNED IGNITIONS</p> <p>The proposed action should describe the project in the context of Federal Wildland Fire Policy and its goals of facilitating public and firefighter safety and maximizing fire’s natural role in wildland ecosystems.</p> <p>“Fire, as a critical natural process, will be integrated into land and resource management plans and activities on a landscape scale, and across agency boundaries. Response to wildland fire is based on ecological, social, and legal consequences of fire. The circumstances under which a fire occurs, and the likely consequences on firefighter and public safety and welfare, natural and cultural resources, and values to be protected dictate the appropriate management response to fire.” 1995/2001 Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>The EIS should discuss the affirmative goal of restoring fire as a critical natural process rather than focusing on the negative goal of avoiding undesirable fires. The EIS should discuss and present the idea of firescapes and strategically placed treatments in the context of safely managing planned and unplanned ignitions, including restoring fire as a critical natural process.</p> <p>In the former case, the EIS should describe Firescapes as a geographic context within which to plan and deploy strategically placed treatments that can facilitate safely managing planned and unplanned ignitions. We refer the Forest Service to the definition and description of Firescapes in the 4FRI Stakeholders' Landscape Strategy document; we suggest the Forest Service use this definition and description to provide additional clarity and specificity to the purpose of Firescapes as an geographic context for planning and deploying strategically placed treatments in a way that serves fire management goals.</p> <p>In the latter case, the EIS should provide additional detail on the relationship between strategically placed treatments and fire management. Specifically, the EIS should describe how restoration treatments can be strategically designed, located and sequenced to efficiently and safely facilitate operational fire management, community protection, and landscape-scale restoration of ecologically beneficial fire regimes at landscape scales. Toward that end, some key questions that the Forest Service should be seeking to answer in the EIS and subsequent analyses are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where and under what conditions can natural ignitions be managed for resource benefit under current Fire Management Plans? • Where can treatments be located to facilitate containment and management of planned or unplanned ignitions within firescapes or subsets thereof? • How can treatments be positioned and sequenced to most efficiently reduce the potential for landscape-scale crown fire? 	
5	<p>Treatment units should be distributed in the project area with spatial patterns of crown fire spread in mind. Overlapping patterns of fuel treatment that reduce horizontal fuel continuity can fragment severe fire behavior and effects into smaller patches if they disrupt heading fire behavior and increase the area burned by fires exhibiting flanking behavior as they move upslope. Slope aspects facing away from frontal or diurnal winds are a lesser priority for treatments because backing fires likely to occur on those sites are the most likely to exhibit</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>mild intensity and cause low-severity effects to vegetation and soil with attendant benefits to ecosystem resources and fire worker safety.</p> <p>The direction of fire spread (backing, flanking, heading) is an important aspect of fire behavior because fire interacts with weather, topography and vegetation to “back” and “flank” around certain fuel and topographic conditions or “head” through others as it moves across the landscape⁶. Steep slopes can facilitate wind-driven convection currents that drive radiant heat upward and bring flames nearer to adjacent unburned vegetation, pre-heating fuels and amplifying fire intensity as it moves upslope⁷. As a result, severe fire effects typically concentrate at upper slope positions and on ridges, whereas such effects are relatively rare on the lee side of slopes that do not directly receive frontal wind⁸.</p> <p>For starters, we suggest the Forest Service consider targeting treatments in fire suppressed VSS 3 stands that are (1) within ¼ mile of roads, (2) that exhibit active or passive crown fire behavior under 95th percentile conditions, and that (3) occur in patches of 50 acres or larger. We also urge the Forest Service to carefully review rationale and analyses employed in the 4FRI Landscape Strategy; the analyses unpinning that document reflect careful thinking about linking restoration and fire management goals in a landscape context. The Forest Service should explicitly include thinning with fire, either in single or multiple, repeated events, within the range of treatment options. Acres precluded from mechanical treatment should not automatically be excluded from fire use; rather, the planning document should consider thinned and non-thinned areas together within a landscape matrix that can safely accommodate natural fires with beneficial ecological effects.</p> <p>Another approach to strategic location of fuel treatments is to identify landscape features that are currently resilient to fire disturbance and use those sites as anchor points for compartmentalization of the project area for long-term fire management oriented to use of unplanned ignitions for resource benefits. Such sites may include natural openings, meadows, relatively open ridges, riparian areas, patches of mature forest with relatively shaded and cool microclimates, and sites where fuel reduction work already has been completed. Such locations can facilitate appropriate fire management responses including confinement and containment strategies as alternatives to full control, as well as provide safe areas for workers to ignite prescribed fires for hazardous fuel reduction and ecological process restoration. Identification of such sites does not necessarily equate to</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>actively treating them. Landscape features that are currently fire resilient, as well as proposed fuel treatment areas, should be spatially mapped and distinguished in analysis of the proposed action.</p> <p>The Forest Service also can prioritize active fuel management in areas where relatively little resource investment may create relatively fire resilient stand conditions. This may include low-productivity sites with little encroachment of small trees (e.g., dry southerly aspects) and relatively open stands that are currently dominated by large conifers. Targeting work in these areas will maximize the area treated and the effectiveness of treatments with available funds and personnel, and thereby provide the greatest opportunity to quickly reduce fuels and restore ecosystem function at larger spatial scales.</p>	
6	<p>TREE-MORTALITY AND OTHER STRUCTURAL CHANGES RESULTING FROM FIRE USE</p> <p>The EIS must describe tree mortality and other structural changes resulting from restoration treatments and from fire management following treatments on an ongoing basis. That is, the forest structure resulting from thinning, or the forest structure today in areas that will go unthinned, will change over time by virtue of fire effects. The EIS needs to characterize those ongoing changes and incorporate them into forest modeling. Losses of canopy, large trees, small trees and resulting recruitment of logs and snags will affect long-term forest dynamics, stand development and wildlife habitat suitability. We urge the Forest Service to exhibit caution in so doing: Post-treatment large tree mortality have exceeded planning targets at several restoration sites in northern Arizona.</p>	
7	<p>THE FOREST SERVICE MUST PROTECT MEXICAN SPOTTED OWL (MSO) HABITAT AND VIABILITY WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA</p> <p>Due to the scale of 4FRI, the Forest Service’s actions will cause great changes to the forest during a short timeframe. Decisions made under this plan can have rapid and long-term consequences. Unfortunately, the Forest Service will not have a chance to incorporate lessons learned during implementation of the first 4FRI EIS and Record of Decision (ROD) into this Rim Country EIS. Because of this, the Forest Service risks incidental “take” of MSO as this project proceeds.</p> <p>We are very concerned about the implementation of new management approaches for MSO, and that is one of the points on record as part of an unresolved appeal against the 2015 revised Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Land and Resource Management Plan, which we filed in partnership with the Center for Biological Diversity, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council, Western Watersheds Project, and White Mountain Conservation League (Letter from Center for Biological Diversity et al. to USDA Forest Service dated December 24, 2015, p.21).</p> <p>The Forest Service must disclose all sources of uncertainty about the impact to MSO from its actions related to this project, and detail how it will reduce uncertainty and learn from its actions. The Forest Service should act conservatively to protect MSO habitat and consider all cautions identified in the revised Recovery Plan for Mexican spotted owl (USDI 2012).</p> <p>The Forest Service is proposing to cut trees up to 17.9 inches d.b.h. within MSO Protected Activity Centers (PACs). Since 1996, the Forest Service has only removed trees up to 9 inches in PACs, and there is not enough monitoring data to know how MSO are responding to this new treatment, which allows trees of double the size previously allowed to be removed. The Forest Service must report on how they will detect and respond to negative impacts on this threatened species' population.</p> <p>According to a report prepared for the 4FRI team, median canopy cover for Mexican spotted owls foraging and roosting in mixed conifer forests is greater than 60 percent. Note, "75% of stands used for roosting had canopy cover >60%."9. The Upper Gila Mountains Recovery Unit is an important unit for MSO populations, where management decisions can affect MSOs outside the Recovery Unit10. Further:</p> <p>"Current data indicate that owls within the UGM RU are most common in mixed-conifer and ponderosa pine–Gambel oak stands with high basal area and canopy cover. These stands frequently have a prominent hardwood component and numerous large trees and snags. Most are uneven-aged, with variable age- and size-classes of trees and snags and considerable volumes of down logs. These are not the kinds of stand structures that forest managers typically try to create in restoration activities in ponderosa pine and mixed-conifer forests that evolved with relatively frequent fire (for example, Cooper 1960, Dieterich 1983, Covington and Moore 1994, Fulé and others 1997, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2009, Cocks and others 2005, Kaufmann and others 2007; see also Beier and Maschinski 2003). The conditions typical of owl nesting and roosting habitat</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>therefore are frequently viewed as “unsustainable” and unnatural in these systems (Johnson 1994). How then did Mexican spotted owls, which apparently occurred historically in these forest types (for example, Ligon 1926, Steele 1927, Bailey 1928, Huey 1930), come to specialize on these types of forest stands (for example, Hutto and others 2008)? Were such stands (or perhaps patches smaller than stands) present historically in these landscapes, for example in fire refugia (Camp and others 1997) such as north-facing slopes or rocky canyon slopes? If so, is there a minimum size to suitable patches for nesting and/or roosting owls? Or were spotted owls able to exist and persist in stands with lower basal area, canopy cover, and fuel loads?... The problem is that we do not know where potential thresholds may lie, or how far we can reduce stand conditions before those stands no longer provide habitat for spotted owls.”¹¹ (bold emphasis added)</p> <p>In light of the fact that thresholds for Mexican spotted owl-occupied stand density have not been determined, the Forest Service should not risk destroying the habitat for this threatened species. The Forest Service should have a strong monitoring plan in place with clearly defined thresholds, trigger points for action, and a contingency plan in case those trigger points are met. The Forest Service must create a monitoring plan for MSO that includes a sufficient number of control and treatment sites to generate statistical power and usable data. The Forest Service should not construct roads within PACs.</p>	
8	<p>THE FOREST SERVICE MUST PROTECT NORTHERN GOSHAWK AND CANOPY-DEPENDENT SPECIES</p> <p>We are also concerned about the implementation of new management approaches for the sensitive northern goshawk, which is another of the points on record as part of an unresolved appeal against the 2015 revised Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests Land and Resource Management Plan, which we filed in partnership with the Center for Biological Diversity, Grand Canyon Wildlands Council, Western Watersheds Project, and White Mountain Conservation League (Letter from Center for Biological Diversity et al. to USDA Forest Service dated December 24, 2015, pp. 21-25). We incorporate our concerns about northern goshawk by reference to the letter from Center for Biological Diversity et al. to USDA Forest Service dated December 24, 2015, pp. 21-25, and it is attached with our email.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>According to the 1996 Record of Decision for the northern goshawk plan amendments, which set forth the mandatory standards and guidelines for ecosystem management within Northern goshawk habitats, “it is important to maintain a diversity of cover types and vegetation structural stages across landscapes to sustain healthy wildlife populations and communities,”¹² and the Forest Service should, “Sustain a mosaic of vegetation densities (overstory and understory), age classes and species composition across the landscape. Provide foods and cover for goshawk prey.”¹³ The Forest Service should not implement a ‘once size fits all’ approach to treating forests, but instead should leave a mix of densities and cover types, including patches with high density. Later seral stages should be protected intact where possible. Dense understory habitats and coarse woody debris, which are important to goshawk prey species, should also be kept intact or enhanced where possible. Old growth patches with interlocking tree crowns should remain.</p> <p>Appendix C to the 1996 Record of Decision for the northern goshawk plan amendments set forth mandatory standards and guidelines for ecosystem management within Northern goshawk habitats, including, but not limited to the following. We suggest adhering to these policies rather than experimentally applying new management protocols across a large part of the landscape, with unforeseen outcomes:</p> <p>(1) The Forest Service must survey the management analysis area prior to any habitat modifying activities, including a ½ mile beyond the proposed project boundary. The Forest Service must use the R3 survey protocol in order to get complete coverage of the management analysis area, and must complete at least one year of surveys.</p> <p>(2) The Forest Service must establish and delineate on a map, a post-fledgling family area that includes 6 nesting areas per pair of nesting goshawks for known nest sites, old nest sites, areas where there is historic data of past nest sites, and where there have been repeated sightings. A post-fledgling family area (PFA) must be approximately 600 acres in size, and must include the nest sites and habitat most likely to be used by the fledglings during their early development. The 6 identified nest sites should each be approximately 30 acres in size, requiring a minimum total of 180 acres of nest areas within each PFA.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>(3) The Forest Service must manage for uneven-age stand conditions for live trees and retain live reserve trees, snags, downed logs, and woody debris levels;</p> <p>(4) The Forest Service must manage for old age trees such that as much old forest structure as possible is sustained over time across the landscape;</p> <p>(5) The Forest Service must sustain a mosaic of vegetation densities, age classes and species composition across the landscape;</p> <p>(6) The Forest Service must provide foods and cover for goshawk prey;</p> <p>(7) The Forest Service must limit human activity in nesting areas and near PFAs during the breeding season, which extends from March 1 to September 30;</p> <p>(8) The Forest Service must manage the ground surface layer to maintain satisfactory soil conditions i.e., minimize soil compaction and maintain hydrologic and nutrient cycles;</p> <p>(9) The required habitat structures, such as tree size, snags, dead and down material, etc., are to be evaluated at (a) the ecosystem management area level, (b) the mid-scale such as drainage, and (c) the small scale of site.</p> <p>(10) For areas outside of PFAs, the required distribution of vegetation structural stages is 10% VSS1, 10% VSS2, 20% VSS3, 20% VSS4, 20% VSS5, and 20% VSS6. (Actual percentages may vary + or – up to 3%).</p> <p>(11) Snags are to be 18 inches or larger dbh and 30 feet or larger in height, downed logs are to be 12 inches in diameter and at least 8 feet long, and woody debris must be 3 inches or larger on the forest floor.</p> <p>(12) For areas outside PFAs, canopy cover for Ponderosa pine forest is to average 40+% for VSS4, 5, and 6.</p> <p>(13) Within PFAs, the canopy cover for Ponderosa pine forest is to average 50+% for VSS4, 5, and 6.</p> <p>(14) Within nesting areas, the area must contain only mature to old forest (VSS5 and 6) having a canopy cover between 50-70% and with mid-aged VSS6 trees 200-300 years old.</p> <p>(15) Road densities are to be managed at the lowest level possible, and where timber harvesting is prescribed to achieve desired forest conditions, the Forest Service is to use small, skid trails in lieu of roads.</p>	
9	<p>RESTORATION OF SPRINGS AND STREAMS</p> <p>We support the effort to improve the condition and function of streams and springs throughout the project area by reducing road density, improving road crossings, maintaining natural flow regimes, and providing habitat connectivity. (PA p. 5) Because of the high density of streams and wet meadows in the project area, efforts to protect soils, reduce erosion and sedimentation, and prevent</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>noxious weed introductions are extremely important. A thorough scientific inventory of the springs within the project area has never been completed, and as part of this project, the Forest Service should document the location, condition, and type of all springs encountered during treatment. The Forest Service should work with university or US Geological Survey scientists to create a spring database (or augment an existing database) that will be useful into the future.</p>	
10	<p>THE FOREST SERVICE MUST PROTECT ECOTONES AND DIVERSE HABITAT TYPES</p> <p>According to the PA, “The Rim Country Project includes extensive areas where the ponderosa pine and mixed conifer cover types interface with the pinyon-juniper and oak woodland types. Because of this close association, some facilitative operations may be needed in these other, non-target cover types (such as pinyon-juniper) to support, increase the safety and effectiveness of, and minimize surface disturbance of treatments to restore the frequent-fire forest structure in the target cover types (ponderosa pine types).”</p> <p>Pinyon pines in particular provide important wildlife habitat and cultural values, grow slowly, and are susceptible to drought¹⁴¹⁵¹⁶¹⁷. These slow growing trees need to be protected, but there is no standard for prioritizing their retention on the landscape, and measurements applied to other trees such as diameter at breast height are not as useful for determining whether pinyon and juniper are old growth or newly established.</p> <p>Pinyon-juniper woodlands support high avian abundance and diversity, with many obligate and semi-obligate species, and with a low level of avian community similarity to other forest habitats. Sieg (1991) found higher bird abundance in pinyon-juniper woodlands in Utah during every season than were found in adjacent grasslands. An estimated 1,000 species are associated with pinyon pines in the southwest²⁰, and pinyon pines hold cultural significance (i.e., pine nut gathering). Slow-growing pinyons are extremely drought sensitive, unlike their juniper counterparts²¹²². Within the last 15 years, pinyon mortality has occurred throughout the southwest, exceeding 90% in some places²³. Therefore, even though the two trees often coexist, pinyon and juniper may require separate management strategies to maintain biodiversity. After the massive die-offs of pinyon pine that have occurred over the last 15 years²⁴, we should not gratuitously remove them from the landscape. Pinyon pine should not</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>be intentionally removed from the landscape when habitat restoration is a project goal.</p> <p>No tree species should be unilaterally removed to create homogenous ponderosa pine stands. Ecotones can be areas of higher biodiversity, novel genotypes and adaptive variations²⁵²⁶ and therefore may provide refugia for species in a changing climate. They can also be places of rapid landscape response to climate, and a diverse forest will be more resilient than a monoculture²⁷. Also, the Forest Service should acknowledge the role of grazing in juniper expansion. On page 8 of the PA, the Forest Service reports:</p> <p>In the meadows and grasslands of the Rim Country project area, conifers and junipers have encroached into these once open grassland habitats, decreasing the size and function of landscapes that were historically grasslands. As tree canopy increases, understory productivity decreases. The grasslands have impaired soil conditions due to inadequate protective ground cover, compacted soil surfaces, and encroaching pines and junipers. In many meadows, vegetative ground cover is low, hydrologic soil function is reduced from compaction, groundwater levels have dropped below root zones due to gully formation, and encroaching upland tree species are competing with desired species. (PA, p. 8)</p>	
11	<p>The Forest Service must disclose the ways that livestock grazing led to these changes in soil compaction, ground cover, and hydrologic function.</p>	
12	<p>“REGENERATION” CUTS SHOULD NOT BE USED TO ENHANCE PONDEROSA SEEDLING RECRUITMENT IN NON-PONDEROSA DOMINATED FOREST TYPES</p> <p>We support the restoration of a more natural forest structure that includes fine-scale openings (generally 0.05 to 1.0 acres) interspersing groups of trees. We do not support the use of “regeneration” gaps cut into mixed conifer types to create openings with the intention of drying out the forest floor and recruiting ponderosa pine seedlings. The Forest Service should focus on creating the next generation of old growth and the goal of these cuts runs counter to the goal of reducing the excess of small trees from the forest. Large trees should not be cut to create regeneration openings.</p> <p>We agree that prescribed fire should be the preferred method for reducing tree density within ecotones and mixed forest types. (PA p. 4)</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
13	<p>ROAD DENSITIES SHOULD BE KEPT TO A MINIMUM AND LOGGING ROADS SHOULD BE OBLITERATED AFTER USE</p> <p>Road densities should be kept to the lowest density possible and all roads created for this project should be immediately closed, obliterated, and obscured when they are no longer needed. Small skid trails should be used in lieu of roads wherever possible. Roads should not be built in MSO PACs.</p>	
14	<p>MONITORING</p> <p>In order to ensure that wildlife is protected and the Forest Service is accountable for its actions, we want to see a carefully crafted and fully-funded monitoring plan. Without monitoring, there is no accountability. Without funding, there will be no monitoring. We are eager to see the final monitoring plan and its funding sources. All monitoring plans should be designed with appropriate statistical power to detect changes across the project area.</p>	
15	<p>FOREST SERVICE MUST ACKNOWLEDGE CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF 4FRI AND GRAZING</p> <p>Livestock grazing and fire suppression continue to encourage unnaturally dense stands of small trees, resulting in elevated competition for available sunlight, water and soil nutrients, decreased abundance and diversity of understory grasses and forbs, and increased density of hazardous fuels.</p> <p>Significant cumulative effects to the environment may result from the proposed action in combination with past, ongoing and foreseeable management activities within and around the project area. The Forest Service is required to take a hard look at such impacts rather than merely list potential causes or mention that some risk may result from a catalogue of activities. The Forest Service is about to engage in the largest forest “restoration” project ever undertaken, and it must address a root cause of the problem.</p> <p>Livestock grazing may cause significant cumulative effects for several reasons. First, grazing directly contributes to fire hazard by impairing soil productivity and altering plant composition, which indirectly contributes to delayed fire rotations, increased forest density, and reduced forage for herbivorous species. In addition, livestock grazing combined with proposed mechanical thinning and prescribed fire treatments may spread exotic plants and reduce the competitive and reproductive capacities of native species. Once established, exotic species</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>may displace natives, in part, because natives are not adapted to ungulate grazing in combination with fire. Grazing must be considered within the Cumulative Effects of this project.</p> <p>Historically, grazing reduced understory vegetation and inhibited the spread of low intensity, low severity fire, creating conditions prime for natural regeneration of ponderosa pine. Livestock grazing decreases understory biomass and density, reducing competition with conifer seedlings and also reducing the ability of the understory to carry low-intensity, low-severity fire, thereby contributing to dense forests with altered species composition²⁸. The increase in small tree density has led to the amount of forest acres burned in recent history. Simultaneously, grazing increases the presence of exotic plant species²⁹. Livestock also compact soils, decreasing the soils' ability to absorb water and increasing erosion³⁰.</p> <p>Restrictions in grazing of livestock after fires, cutting treatments, seeding, plantings, mulching, and aspen treatments may be required as mitigation to reduce impact to forage species. Release from grazing before fire may be required to enable sufficient fuels to accumulate. Post-treatment release from grazing could be required for several years. USDA research has found that excluding cattle from a landscape for five growing seasons "significantly increased: (1) total vegetative cover, (2) native perennial forb cover, (3) grass stature, (4) grass flowering stem density, and (5) the cover of some shrub species and functional groups."³¹. Livestock and wildlife tend to concentrate in seeding treatments, which leads to soil compaction, soil surface disturbance and erosion, and overuse of vegetation.</p> <p>Frequent grazing has in part facilitated invasion by grazing-tolerant, less palatable weedy species by reducing native perennial grass cover. These exotic weedy species have displaced native perennial grasses in parts of the intermountain west because the native plants are not adapted to frequent and close grazing³². Also, many native species are not adapted to frequent ungulate grazing in combination with fire. Grazing is not an effective means of reducing exotic plant cover, and instead can drive non-native plants to compensate and increase growth and reproductive potential in ways that native species cannot.</p> <p>In the cumulative effects section, the Forest Service should specifically: a) Link tree density to historic grazing and associated removal of understory.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>b) Mention interaction of grazing with fire suppression to degrade forests, including old growth forests.</p> <p>c) Mention reduced competitive and reproductive capacities of native species in grazed areas, and that actions associated with grazing can spread exotic plant seed such as cheatgrass.</p> <p>d) Acknowledge that grazing and browsing contributes to aspen decline and is detrimental to aspen recruitment and survival.</p> <p>e) Discuss how grazing impacts springs and riparian areas, and has a negative interaction with off highway vehicle use</p> <p>f) Explain how future livestock management would differ from the past practices that helped lead to unhealthy forests in the first place</p> <p>g) Explain how monitoring will detect problems and what changes might be made to grazing practices in the future, including changes to timing, duration, stocking rates, or availability of pastures</p> <p>h) Acknowledge that removal of livestock after treatment (fire, cutting, or seeding/planting/mulching) may be necessary for a period of years. Only fire is mentioned as potentially impacting the availability of pastures to livestock, but if forests are returning to an unhealthy state (i.e., reduced understory, dense regeneration, altered fire regimes, noxious weeds) then livestock utilization may have to be altered.</p> <p>i) Take a strong position suggesting <i>what</i> changes to grazing might be necessary to achieve a fully restored forest.</p> <p>j) Cite the following sources. The science establishing an interaction between grazing, fire, understory health, and pine recruitment is well established and goes back over half a century. The following peer-reviewed literature contributes to the knowledge that cattle grazing can create effects counter to forest restoration efforts: Kerns et al. 201134 (which describes USDA research: “understory release from a long history of cattle grazing caused a greater degree of change than the initial reintroduction of fire.”), Bakker et al. 201035, Kimball and Schiffman 200336, Allen et al. 200237, Belsky and Blumenthal 199738, Cooper 196039, Madany and West 198340, Savage and Swetnam 199041, Arnold 195042.</p> <p>Use the 4FRI project as an opportunity to study the interactions between forest treatments and livestock grazing. The effects of grazing should be monitored as a learning opportunity. As part of the monitoring plan, the following</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>measurements should be taken and analyzed in relation to presence of grazing and/or time since pasture was grazed: soil moisture, woody species regeneration in meadows, woody species regeneration in within-stand openings; understory density and composition, understory ability to carry fire, noxious weeds.</p> <p>In the affected Environment section for Range in the EIS, the Forest Service should include the actual grazing numbers (annual operating instructions) going back over a period of time. This will help everyone understand what the current state of grazing on the landscape is, and provide a record for future comparisons.</p>	
16	<p>THE FOREST SERVICE SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE ALL CAUSES OF ASPEN DECLINE</p> <p>The Forest Service intends to build and maintain “up to 200 miles of protective barriers springs, aspen, Bebb’s willows, and big-tooth maples, as needed for restoration.” (PA, p. 14). It is true that “Aspen are dying or rapidly declining in the Rim Country project area,” (PA p. 8) and the causes of decline include browsing and grazing. Aspen has gradually declined in part due to browsing by livestock and introduced and native wild ungulates. Wolf reintroductions have improved aspen recruitment and survival where elk were the limiting factor⁴³. When large predators, particularly wolves, were reintroduced to Yellowstone National Park, USA, and Banff National Park, Canada, the wolves brought elk populations to levels that resulted in decreased grazing pressure, allowing aspen populations to rebound⁴⁵. Elk populations consist of larger numbers than historically existed in the project area.</p>	
17	<p>FENCING SHOULD ONLY BE USED WHERE ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY</p> <p>Fencing is expensive, difficult to maintain, unsightly, and blocks movement of many wildlife species that aren’t responsible for overgrazing and overbrowsing on aspen and wetland habitat types. The Forest Service must acknowledge that the lack of – or severely reduced populations of – top predators including wolves exacerbates the problem of overgrazing and overbrowsing on aspen, as does elk overpopulation. Suggested language, approved by stakeholders while developing the Large Tree Retention Strategy for the first 4FRI EIS: “Other factors contributing to gradual aspen decline over the past 140 years include reduced regeneration due to browsing by livestock and introduced and native wild ungulates in the absence of natural predators like wolves.”</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Fencing should only be used as a last resort to protect values at risk from grazing and browsing. The Forest Service instead should use jackstrawing or move stock tanks to deter grazing and browsing of aspen and riparian habitats. No water sources should be provided within a mile of aspen stands. Instead of providing new constructed waters, the focus should be on restoring and protecting natural water sources such as springs and seeps.</p>	
18	<p>INVASIVE PLANTS</p> <p>Domestic livestock, as well as logging, prescribed fire, and other practices that disturb soils, can spread alien weedy species in ponderosa forests. Livestock act as vectors for seed travel, disturb the soil, and reduce the competitive and reproductive capacities of native species. Exotic weeds can displace native species, in part, because native grasses are not adapted to frequent and close grazing⁴⁶⁴⁷. In some portions of the planning area, although the locations relative to active grazing allotments is not disclosed, aggressive alien weeds such as cheatgrass (<i>Bromus tectorum</i>) and spotted knapweed (<i>Centaurea maculosa</i>) have displaced native species. The potential for significant cumulative impacts of noxious weed spread in the project area is high because McGlone and others (2009)⁴⁸ showed that cheatgrass abundance and distribution increased 90-fold above a pre-treatment baseline as a result of forest treatments similar to the proposed action.</p> <p>The presence of cheatgrass has important long-term implications for native plant communities. Melgoza and co-workers (1990)⁴⁹ studied cheatgrass soil resource acquisition after fire and note its competitive success owing to its ability suppress the water uptake and productivity of native species for extended periods of time. They further note that cheatgrass dominance is enhanced by its high tolerance to grazing (also see Mack 1981).</p> <p>Cheatgrass is well adapted to fire and often dominates plant communities after disturbance⁵¹. Its annual life-form coupled with the abilities to germinate readily over a wide range of moisture and temperature conditions, to quickly establish an extensive root system, and to grow early in the spring contribute to its successful colonization⁵². Some native species also exhibit this trait, but greenhouse and field studies show that cheatgrass effectively competes with seedlings of perennial species⁵³⁵⁴⁵⁵. In addition, cheatgrass successfully competes with the native species that survive fire, despite these plants being</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>well-established adult individuals able to reach deeper levels in the soil⁵⁶. This competitive ability of cheatgrass contributes to its post-fire dominance.</p>	
19	<p>SOILS</p> <p>The EIS should identify soil types on which mechanical treatments, piling and pile burning should be prohibited owing to vulnerability to soil disturbance. It should also include mandatory procedures for preventing soil erosion during mechanical treatments. We are not at all convinced that best management practices will prevent unacceptably detrimental soil conditions where ground-based log skidding occurs. The EIS should relate slope steepness to soil erosion hazard or soil structure throughout the project area; it should disclose exactly where ground-based skidding and mechanical treatments may and should not occur. The Forest Service should evaluate soil erosion hazard at multiple scales, using watersheds and sub-watersheds to delineate between those scales.</p> <p>We have seen extensive soil damage occur within the Flagstaff Watershed Protection Project area, resulting from operations occurring during wet and muddy conditions. Every effort should be taken to stop operations during wet conditions to prevent rutting and gullyng.</p>	
20	<p>MISTLETOE TREATMENTS</p> <p>Because this project is intended to improve and restore forest and ecosystem health, structure, functioning, and resilience, and not for timber production, mistletoe treatments are unwarranted and counterproductive, especially if they focus on removing the largest trees as a treatment method. Research repeatedly shows that mistletoe is an important component of healthy forest habitats, and large trees with mistletoe brooms provide essential food and occupancy needs to wildlife.</p> <p>Worldwide, species in 97 vertebrate families consume mistletoe and species in 50 vertebrate families use mistletoe for nesting; therefore mistletoe can be considered a keystone species in forest ecosystems⁵⁷. Mistletoe brooms provide essential wildlife nesting, foraging, caching, resting, and roosting habitat for sites for Abert squirrel, porcupine, and passerine birds; managers should retain some broomed trees as wildlife habitat⁵⁸⁵⁹. Bird species richness in southwestern ponderosa pine forest positively correlates with level of dwarf mistletoe, and no bird species appear to have a negative correlation with dwarf mistletoe⁶⁰. Mistletoe provides a consistent food-based moisture source for squirrels⁶¹. Deer</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>use was significantly higher in tree clusters with dwarf mistletoe in the Wet Beaver Creek watershed⁶². Mistletoes provide a climatically stable food resource for avian frugivores, even when other tree-based foods are unavailable due to drought. Plants that rely on birds to disperse seeds benefit from mistletoe, which correlates with bird presence through a range of climatic conditions⁶³. Red squirrels rely on specific types of mistletoe brooms for nesting in mixed-conifer forests in northern Arizona and New Mexico⁶⁴).</p> <p>Mistletoe provides inclement weather protection to porcupines in Douglas-fir⁶⁵ and pine-juniper forests⁶⁶. Number of branches within a mistletoe broom and tree height correlate with probability of Abert squirrel caching, foraging, and nesting. Taller trees with mistletoe are most important. Forest managers should keep trees > 18 m and with brooms having > 7 branches⁶⁷.</p> <p>Besides, since fire causes more scorch and there is higher fire mortality in medium scorch classes with mistletoe, if these areas are expected to burn in the future, mistletoe populations exposed to managed fire will be kept in check without intervention.</p>	
Letter 31		Chad Hanson, John Muir Project
1	<p>On behalf of the John Muir Project of Earth Island Institute, we offer the following scoping comments on the proposed 4FRI Rim Country Project. The proposal makes numerous assumptions that are inconsistent with current science with regard to fire history, fire trends, and post-fire effects in these forest ecosystems.</p> <p><u>These Forests Do Not Have an Unnatural Excess of Fire, or High-Intensity Fire, and Future Trends May Be Downward</u></p> <p>Current science from the Forest Service and others concludes: 1) there is currently a deficit of fire in the forests proposed for logging in this region, relative to natural levels (Parks et al. 2015--attached); 2) there is also less high-severity fire, in particular, now than there was historically, and fire severity is not increasing (Baker 2015--attached); and 3) the most comprehensive and current climate change projections from Forest Service and university scientists, incorporating not only future climate changes but also vegetation shifts that will result due to climate change this century, concludes that fire severity will, overall, decrease slightly to moderately over the 21st century in the forests of this region (Parks et al. 2016--attached).</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
2	<p><u>Large High-Intensity Fire Patches Did Sometimes Occur Historically in Ponderosa Pine and Dry Mixed-Conifer Forests of This Area</u></p> <p>Williams and Baker (2012) (Figure 3) reconstructed historical high-intensity fire patches in these forests and mapped numerous areas of large high-intensity fire patches hundreds, and in some cases, thousands of acres in size, and historical forest density was highly variable (Figure 2 of Williams and Baker 2012), with numerous areas of moderately to very dense forests. Historical fires were not almost homogeneously low-intensity, or low/moderate-intensity but, rather, had substantial portions of low, moderate, and high-intensity fire. As discussed in Williams and Baker (2012) and Williams and Baker (2014), their methodology was extensively accuracy-checked, and cross-checked against historical records. Moreover, Williams and Baker (2012) investigated whether there was an inconsistency between their findings and findings of previous tree-ring studies that reported open, low-intensity fire conditions on numerous local areas historically, and in every single case the Williams and Baker (2012) methods also found open, low-intensity fire conditions on these same sites, historically.</p> <p>The point is that open forests dominated by low-intensity fire did indeed exist historically in ponderosa pine and dry mixed-conifer forests of the proposed project area, but they were not the only condition that existed, and did not even represent the majority in many areas. In the same forest types in the same landscapes, simultaneously there were much denser forests with mixed- and high-intensity fire effects. These findings are further supported by paleoecological data (see, e.g., Jenkins et al. 2011). Even though some reconstructions of overall fire frequency indicate relatively frequent fire, on average, at localized sites, this same research reports that frequencies were highly variable, especially at larger spatial scales, and there were often fire-free periods of several decades in ponderosa pine forests of Arizona historically (Swetnam and Baisan 1996, Tables 3 and 4). Further, in the history of fire occurrence in southwest ponderosa pine forests, “large crown fires” have naturally occurred in particular during warm, dry periods that follow a couple of wet years (Roos and Swetnam 2011).</p>	
3	<p><u>Mexican Spotted Owls are Thriving in Large Mixed-Intensity Fires, in the Absence of Post-Fire Logging</u></p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>The current data indicate that large mixed-intensity fires, without post-fire logging, benefit Mexican Spotted Owl occupancy and reproduction (see attached reports by Moors and Ward, 2011-2013, from fires in Arizona). Moreover, Ganey et al. (2014) found that Mexican Spotted Owls left unburned old forest nest sites in the winter and traveled up to 14 kilometers to spend the winter months foraging in mixed-intensity fire areas (in comparable forests in terms of elevation and forest type), where the small mammal prey base (in terms of small mammal biomass) was 2-6 times greater than in their unburned nest sites.</p>	
4	<p><u>Optimal Conditions for Forest Birds are Created by Mixed-Intensity Fires in Southwest Ponderosa Pine Forests, Not By Nearly Homogeneous Low-Intensity Fires</u></p> <p>Latif et al. (2016) found, in ponderosa pine forests of Arizona, that overall forest bird diversity was maximized by mixed-intensity fire, including significant occurrence of high-intensity fire, since numerous species were strongly positively associated with high-intensity fire patches, while others selected low/moderate-intensity areas. These findings stand in contrast to common assumptions that biodiversity in southwest ponderosa pine forests will benefit to the greatest extent from a fire regime that is heavily dominated by low-intensity fire, and which has very little moderate- and high-intensity fire.</p>	
5	<p><u>Large Forest Fires in Arizona Over the Past Decade Are Heavily Dominated by Low/Moderate-Intensity Effects</u></p> <p>A common misconception is that the largest fires that have occurred over the past decade in Arizona’s forests, including ponderosa pine and dry mixed-conifer forests, have been predominantly high-intensity, whereas the data indicate that these fires are heavily dominated by low/moderate-intensity fire effects, and often have only about 8% to 12% high-intensity fire effects, based on the final categorical fire severity assessments by USGS and USFS, after experts from these agencies have corrected fire severity mapping from satellites for clear errors based on one-year post-fire imagery (www.mtbs.gov). Examples include the Wallow fire of 2011 and the Horseshoe2 fire of 2011 (www.mtbs.gov). One of the sources of misconceptions is that much of the reporting regarding these fires occurs shortly after the fires occur, based on initial, preliminary fire severity mapping from the “RAVG” system, which does not account for “flushing” of ponderosa pines at one year post-fire (i.e.,</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	production of new green needles from surviving terminal buds in pines where the needles were killed by radiant heat). This can result in a severe overestimation of fire severity, such as occurred with the Wallow fire, for example (compare RAVG and MTBS maps).	
Letter 32		Greg Dyson, Wild Earth Guardians
1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide scoping comments on the 4FRI Rim Country Project.</p> <p>WildEarth Guardians is a nonprofit conservation organization with offices in Tucson, Arizona, Santa Fe, New Mexico, and five other states. WildEarth Guardians has more than 160,000 members and activists across the United States and the world. We protect and restore wildlife, wild places, wild rivers, and the health of the American West.</p>	
2	<p>Minimum Road System</p> <p>The Forest Service faces many challenges with its vastly oversized, under-maintained, and unaffordable road system. The impacts from roads to water, fish, wildlife, and ecosystems are tremendous and well documented in scientific literature. Given that the 4FRI Rim Country Project is considering changes to a large number of miles of roads, and given its large geographic scale, this is precisely the type of project where the Forest Service must consider its Travel Analysis Reports (TARs) for the three national forests, and more importantly, it must identify the Minimum Road System (MRS).¹ We urge the Forest Service to carefully evaluate the proposed 4FRI Rim Country Project and its alternatives through this lens. This type of large-scale project is the perfect opportunity to begin making on-the-ground progress towards an economically and environmentally sustainable road network.</p> <p>We are very encouraged to see this project considering ecosystem restoration on a large scale to address many of the factors that continue to degrade ecosystems. We fully support ecosystem restoration, especially the project components that address water quality and aquatic habitats and improve watersheds and forest resiliency by returning expensive and deteriorating forest roads to the wild.</p>	
3	To address its sustainable and deteriorating road system, the Forest Service promulgated the Roads Rule (referred to as “subpart A”) in 2001. 66 Fed. Reg. 3206 (Jan. 12, 2001); 36 C.F.R. part 212, subpart A. The Roads Rule created two important obligations for the agency. One obligation is to identify unneeded roads to prioritize for decommissioning or to be considered for other uses. 36	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>C.F.R. § 212.5(b)(2). Another obligation is to identify the MRS needed for safe and efficient travel and for the protection, management, and use of National Forest system lands. <i>Id.</i> § 212.5(b)(1).² The MRS is the road system, determined by the Forest Service, as needed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Meet resource and other management objectives adopted in the relevant land and resource management plan, <input type="checkbox"/> Meet applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, <input type="checkbox"/> Reflect longterm funding expectations, and <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that the identified system minimizes adverse environmental impacts associated with road construction, reconstruction, decommissioning, and maintenance. <p><i>Id.</i> (hereafter, MRS factors). <i>See also</i> Memorandum from Leslie Weldon to Regional Foresters <i>et al.</i> on Travel Management, Implementation of 36 CFR, Part 212, Subpart A (Mar. 29, 2012) (hereafter, 2012 Weldon Memo). The goal of subpart A is “to maintain an appropriately sized and environmentally sustainable road system that is responsive to ecological, economic, and social concerns.”³ The Forest Service’s Washington Office has issued a series of directive memoranda that outline how the agency expects forests to comply with subpart A.⁴ Pursuant to its own regulations and directive memoranda, the Forest Service must consider the valid portions of its TARs and begin to determine the MRS in its analysis of site-specific projects of the appropriate geographic size under NEPA. <i>See</i> 2012 Weldon Memo at 2 (directing forests to “analyze the proposed action and alternatives in terms of whether, per 36 CFR 212.5(b)(1), the resulting [road] system is needed”). By analyzing whether a proposed project is consistent with the relevant portions of the TAR, and considering the MRS factors under 36 CFR 212.5(b)(1), the Forest Service expects each forest to identify the MRS for particular forest segments. <i>Id.</i> (“The resulting decision [in a site-specific project] identifies the MRS and unneeded roads for each subwatershed or larger scale”).</p>	
4	<p>It is now time for the Forest Service to take the next step under subpart A: identify the MRS through site-specific projects subject to NEPA. This project provides the appropriate geographic scale for the Forest Service to identify the MRS. The Forest Service’s Washington Office has directed forests to use the TAR to identify the MRS for proposed actions at the scale of a 6th code subwatershed or larger. 2012 Weldon Memo at 2. <i>See also</i> 2012 FAQs (noting that “travel analysis and identification of the MRS could be done at the same</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>scale, if that scale is at the ranger district or unit level.”). Plus, consideration of the MRS factors at 36 C.F.R. § 212.5(b)(1) only makes sense on a larger geographic scale. Pursuant to the plain language of the agency’s own regulations and directive memoranda interpreting those regulations, the Forest Service must identify the MRS when analyzing the 4FRI Rim Country Project under NEPA. <i>See, e.g.</i>, 2012 Weldon Memo at 2 (“Travel analysis should be used to inform the environmental analysis.”) Subpart A directs the agency to “identify the roads on lands under Forest Service jurisdiction that are no longer needed.”⁶ It refers to all roads, not just National Forest System roads. The rules define a road as “[a] motor vehicle travelway over 50 inches wide, unless designated and managed as a trail.”</p> <p>The Forest Service must ensure that the actions proposed under the 4FRI Rim Country Project are consistent with subpart A. Here, this project proposes to decommission approximately 230 miles of system and unauthorized roads on the Coconino and Apache-Sitgreaves and 20 miles of unauthorized roads on the Tonto, and improve 150 miles of road, and build 350 miles of temporary roads. The forest must assess these proposed actions in relation to the TARs as well as the factors for an MRS, with the goal of minimizing adverse environmental impacts. Specifically, the decisions to close, decommission, or maintain certain roads should reflect the results from the risks and benefits analysis in the TARs. Routes identified for decommissioning through the TARs or other processes within the project area must be closed, decommissioned, and reclaimed to a stable and more natural condition during the life of the project. To the extent that the final decision in this project differs from what is recommended in the TARs, the Forest Service must provide an explanation for that inconsistency.</p>	
5	<p>The Forest Service should prioritize road decommissioning in this project to enhance landscape connectivity and ecological integrity based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Effectiveness in reducing fragmentation, connecting un-roaded and lightly-roaded areas, and improving stream segments, with a focus on inventoried roadless areas, important watersheds, and other sensitive ecological and conservation areas and corridors; <input type="checkbox"/> Benefit to species and habitats, including restoring aquatic and terrestrial habitats and habitat connections; <input type="checkbox"/> Addressing impaired or at-risk watersheds; <input type="checkbox"/> Achieving motorized route density standards; and 	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
6	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Enhancement of quite recreation experiences.</p> <p>The Forest Service should use the National Best Management Practices for Water Quality Management on National Forest System Lands (Volume 1, April 2012) (<i>available at http://www.fs.fed.us/biology/resources/pubs/watershed/FS_National_Core_BMP_s_April2012.pdf</i>) to guide road management in determining the MRS. The BMP program “was developed to improve agency performance and accountability in managing water quality consistent with the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and State water quality programs” and “[c]urrent Forest Service policy directs compliance with required CWA permits and State regulations and requires the use of BMPs to control nonpoint source pollution to meet applicable water quality standards and other CWA requirements.” National Best Management Practices. It directs forests to:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Design the transportation system to meet longterm land management plan desired conditions, goals, and objectives for access rather than to access individual sites.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Limit roads to the minimum practicable number, width, and total length consistent with the purpose of specific operations, local topography, geology, and climate to achieve land management plan desired conditions, goals, and objectives for access and water quality management.</p> <p><i>Id.</i> at 104. We urge the Coconino, Apache-Sitgreaves and Tonto National Forests to limit their road networks to those roads that are necessary for access and management, and which can be adequately maintained within agency budgets and capabilities. While it appears the Coconino and Apache- Sitgreaves are taking this responsibility serious, it also appears the Tonto is not. We encourage road decommissioning and reductions in road density to improve watershed conditions and aquatic health in streams, as well as to protect and enhance wildlife habitat and connectivity. The Forest Service should continue working to reduce sediment delivery from roads, improve or remove road crossings, and close or decommission roads that cannot be adequately maintained.</p>	
7	<p>National Forests provide a range of significant environmental and societal benefits, including clean air and water, habitat for myriad wildlife species, and outdoor recreation opportunities for millions of visitors and local residents each year. <i>See</i> 66 Fed. Reg. 3244, 3245-47 (Jan. 12, 2001) (Preamble to Roadless Area Conservation Rule describing key ecosystem and other services of roadless National Forest lands). The Forest Service’s extensive and decaying road system,</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>however, poses a growing liability to the future ability of the National Forests to provide critical environmental, ecosystem, and recreation services. Collectively, the National Forest System contains over 370,000 miles of roads (not even counting the tens of thousands of additional miles of unclassified, non-system, temporary, and user-created roads). That is nearly eight times the length of the entire U.S. Interstate Highway System. The National Forest road system is primarily a byproduct of the big timber era. The system is often convoluted, unmanageable, and ineffective at meeting 21st century transportation needs.</p> <p>Much of the system is in serious disrepair: as of the end of Fiscal Year 2015, the National Forest <i>WildEarth Guardians – Weminuche Landscape Grazing DEIS Comments – April 4, 2016</i> 5road system had a 3 billion dollar maintenance backlog. USDA, Forest Service, National Forest System Statistics 2015.</p> <p>Well-sited and maintained roads provide important services to society. But the adverse ecological and environmental impacts associated with the Forest Service’s massive and deteriorating road system are well documented. Those adverse impacts are long-term, occur at multiple scales, and often extend far beyond the actual “footprint” of the road. Included in these comments is a 2014 literature review from The Wilderness Society that surveys the extensive and best available scientific literature—including the Forest Service’s General Technical Report synthesizing the scientific information on forest roads (Gucinski 2001)—on a wide range of road-related impacts to ecosystem processes and integrity on National Forest lands. <i>See The Wilderness Society, Transportation Infrastructure and Access on National Forests and Grasslands: A Literature Review</i> (May 2014) (attached as Exhibit A).</p>	
8	<p>Erosion, compaction, and other alterations in forest geomorphology and hydrology associated with roads seriously impair water quality and aquatic species viability. <i>See Exhibit B at 2-4.</i> Roads disturb and fragment wildlife habitat, altering species distribution, interfering with critical life functions such as feeding, breeding, and nesting, and resulting in loss of biodiversity. <i>Id.</i> at 4-6. Roads facilitate increased human intrusion into sensitive areas, resulting in poaching of rare plants and animals, human-ignited wildfires, introduction of exotic species, and damage to archaeological resources. <i>Id.</i> at 6, 9. Roads are also major vectors for spreading weeds.</p>	
9	<p>A robust analysis under NEPA of the forest road system and its environmental and social impacts is especially critical in the context of climate change. As the CEQ’s recent draft guidance on addressing climate change in NEPA analyses</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>recognizes, “[c]limate change can increase the vulnerability of a resource, ecosystem, human community, or structure, which would then be more susceptible to climate change and other effects and result in a proposed action’s effects being more environmentally damaging.” CEQ, <i>Revised Draft Guidance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change Impacts</i> (Dec. 18, 2014), at 22. The draft CEQ guidance makes clear that “[s]uch considerations are squarely within the realm of NEPA, informing decisions on whether to proceed with and how to design the proposed action so as to minimize impacts on the environment, as well as informing possible adaptation measures to address these impacts, ultimately enabling the selection of smarter, more resilient actions.” <i>Id.</i> Climate change intensifies the adverse impacts associated with roads. The Forest Service should consider the risk of increased disturbance when analyzing this proposed project.</p> <p>For example, as the warming climate alters species distribution and forces wildlife migration, landscape connectivity becomes even more critical to species survival and ecosystem resilience. <i>Id.</i> at 9-14. <i>See also</i> USDA, Forest Service, <i>National Roadmap for Responding to Climate Change</i> at 26 (2011), available at http://www.fs.fed.us/climatechange/pdf/Roadmapfinal.pdf (recognizing importance of reducing fragmentation and increasing connectivity to facilitate climate change adaptation). Climate change is also expected to lead to more extreme weather events, resulting in increased flood severity, more frequent landslides, altered hydrographs, and changes in erosion and sedimentation rates and delivery processes. Many National Forest roads are poorly located and designed to be temporarily on the landscape, making them particularly vulnerable to these climate alterations. Even those designed for storms and water flows typical of past decades may fail under future weather scenarios, further exacerbating adverse ecological impacts, public safety concerns, and maintenance <i>WildEarth Guardians – Weminuche Landscape Grazing DEIS Comments – April 4, 2016</i> 6 needs. The Forest Service should analyze in detail the impact of climate change on forest roads and forest resources.</p>	
10	<p>The President’s Executive Order 13,653 (Nov. 2013) provides direction on “Preparing the United States for the Impacts of Climate Change.” The Order recognizes that “[t]he impacts of climate change – including an increase in prolonged periods of excessively high temperatures, more heavy downpours, an increase in wildfires, [and] more severe droughts . . . – are already affecting communities, natural resources, ecosystems, economies, and public health across the Nation,” and that “managing th[o]se risks requires deliberate preparation,</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>close cooperation, and coordinated planning . . . to improve climate preparedness and resilience; help safeguard our economy, infrastructure, environment, and natural resources; and provide for the continuity of . . . agency operations, services, and programs.” Exec. Order 13,653, § 1. To that end, the Order requires agencies to take various actions aimed at making “watersheds, natural resources, and ecosystems, and the communities and economies that depend on them, more resilient in the face of a changing climate.” <i>Id.</i> § 3. For example, “recognizing the many benefits the Nation’s natural infrastructure provides, agencies shall, where possible, focus on program and policy adjustments that promote the dual goals of greater climate resilience and carbon sequestration.” <i>Id.</i> Agencies also must develop and implement adaptation plans that “evaluate the most significant climate change related risks to, and vulnerabilities in, agency operations and missions in both the short and long term, and outline actions . . . to manage these risks and vulnerabilities.” <i>Id.</i> § 5(a). The Forest Service’s 2014 adaptation plan recognizes that the wide range of environmental and societal benefits provided by our national forests “are connected and sustained through the integrity of the ecosystems on these lands.” <i>See</i> USDA Forest Service, <i>Climate Change Adaptation Plan</i>, page 58 (2014).</p> <p>The plan highlights USDA’s 2010-2015 Strategic Plan Goal 2 of “[e]nsur[ing] our national forests . . . are conserved, restored, and made more resilient to climate change, while enhancing our water resources.” <i>Id.</i> at 58. And consistent with section 5(a) of Executive Order 13,653, the plan identifies numerous climate change risks – including increased wildfire, invasive species, increasing water temperatures, extreme weather events, and fluctuating precipitation and temperature – that “pose challenges to sustaining forests and grasslands and the supply of goods and services upon which society depends, such as clean drinking water, forest products, outdoor recreation opportunities, and habitat.” <i>Id.</i> at 60-64. With respect to transportation infrastructure specifically, the adaptation plan recognizes that, “[w]ith increasing heavy rain events, the extensive road system on NFS lands will require increased maintenance and/or modification of infrastructure (e.g. larger culverts or replacement of culverts with bridges).” <i>Id.</i> at 62.</p> <p>The Forest Service’s Climate Change Adaptation Plan points to a number of actions to address the risks of climate change to our forests, and in particular to forest roads. For example, the plan highlights the 2012 Planning Rule as a mechanism to ensure that “National Forest System . . . land management</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>planning policy and procedures include consideration of climate change.” <i>Id.</i> at 73. The final directives to the planning rule echo the importance of designing plan components “to sustain functional ecosystems based on a future viewpoint” and “to adapt to the effects of climate change.” FSH 1909.12, ch. 20, § 23.11. The adaptation plan also points to Forest Service Manual 2020, which provides “Ecological Restoration and Resilience” directives designed “to restore and maintain resilient ecosystems that will have greater capacity to withstand stressors and recover from disturbances, especially those under changing and uncertain environmental conditions, including climate change and extreme weather events.” Exhibit D at 73.</p>	
11	<p>For all these reasons, the Forest Service must include the MRS as one of the alternatives in its analysis. Subpart A defines the MRS as that “needed for safe and efficient travel[;] for administration, utilization, and protection of [forest] lands[; and] to meet resource and other management objectives adopted in the relevant . . . plan.” 36 C.F.R. § 212.5(b)(1).</p>	
12	<p>Temporary Roads Under NEPA, the Forest Service has a duty to consider the effects of its proposed action when added to the existing road and trail network. <i>Wilderness Society v. U.S. Forest Service</i>, 850 F. Supp. 2d 1144, 1157-58 (D. Idaho 2012) (holding the Forest Service was arbitrary and capricious to conclude that designating 94 miles of user-created routes as non-system routes would have no significant impact).</p> <p>Here, the agency is proposing to construct an alarming amount – 350 miles – of temporary roads. Temporary roads must be closed within 10 years of completion of a project, per 16 U.S.C. 1608(a), unless the Forest Service re-evaluates the road and determines it to be necessary for the minimum road system. The Forest Service must ensure that the temporary roads will in fact be temporary by including monitoring and enforcement of the projects and 10 years following completion of the projects. The most obvious way to do this would be through a thorough tracking system for the temporary roads. Therefore, we specifically request that this project incorporates a tracking system for the huge volume of temporary roads in this project so that at any time the agency and the public can see which roads were built (including date and mileage), if the roads have been reclaimed, and when they were reclaimed.</p> <p>During the project and for an additional 10 years after completion of the project, the temporary roads will continue to have very real impacts on the landscape.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>For example, temporary roads will continue to allow for harassment of wildlife, littering, fires, invasive plant distribution, and negative impacts to aquatic and riparian habitat, as well as the fish that depend on that habitat. The agency must consider the effects of its proposal to construct temporary roads when combined with the effects of its minimum road system. It must also consider how construction of the proposed temporary roads will detract from the purpose of subpart A of the agency’s own rules, to “identify the minimum road system needed for safe and efficient travel and for administration, utilization, and protection of the National Forest System lands.” 36 C.F.R. § 212.5(b). This is especially true if the Forest Service fails to provide assurances that the proposed temporary roads will in fact be closed within 10 years of completion of the relevant project.</p> <p>We request that the DEIS addresses these effects from so-called temporary roads. To address these concerns regarding temporary roads, we request an alternative that dramatically reduces the temporary road mileage and requires the temporary roads to be limited to the absolute minimum existence, with a default time-frame of 3 months barring exceptional circumstances that call for a longer timeframe. Seasonal restrictions might also be appropriate, especially in important wildlife habitat (<i>see</i> MSO section, below).</p> <p>The Forest Service must seriously analyze temporary roads, as seen in the United States District Court of Montana case, <i>Native Ecosystems Council v. Krueger</i>, 946 F.Supp.2d 1060 (2013). In that case, environmental groups challenged a timber sale project posed in the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National <i>WildEarth Guardians – Weminuche Landscape Grazing DEIS Comments – April 4, 2016</i> 8 Forest. The thinning and restoration project was set to involve construction of a large number of temporary roads. The Forest Service, after an Environmental Assessment and Wildlife Report were completed, stated that there would be no significant impact on grizzly bears. The Forest Service based this determination on road density statistics that failed to include temporary roads. Because the Forest Service entirely “[failed] to consider an important aspect of the problem”, the case was remanded to the Forest Service to perform a new biological assessment to resolve the question of whether the Project “may affect” grizzly bears in the area.</p>	
13	<p>Mexican Spotted Owl The 4FRI Rim Country Project proposes mechanical thinning and/or prescribed fire on about 68,630 acres of Mexican spotted owl (MSO) protected activity</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>centers (PACs) and over 128,800 acres of recovery habitat. In reference to these proposed actions, we make the following comments and considerations, all based on the 2012 MSO Recovery Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to see a better distinction between management actions and habitat needs in riparian habitat versus upland habitat. <i>See id.</i> at 271. • “Ongoing climate change will result in unpredictable changes in habitat distribution and quality, and this creates considerable uncertainty in developing strategies to recover the owl. Again, this argues for preserving options where possible, as well as for attempting to account for potential changes in habitat distribution and quality.” <i>Id.</i> at 250. • “Given our lack of experience and demonstrated expertise in purposely creating the forest structure used by owls, the recommendations for PACs focus on minimizing management.” <i>Id.</i> at 257. • “In many cases, strategic treatments on surrounding and/or adjoining lands will reduce fire risk sufficiently so that, in the short term, treatments are not needed within PACs (Ager et al. 2007, Finney et al. 2007, Ager et al. 2010).” <i>Id.</i> at 258. • “No mechanical or prescribed fire treatments should occur within PACs during the breeding season unless non-breeding is inferred or confirmed that year per the accepted protocol.” <i>Id.</i> at 261. • There is reference in the scoping letter to a vague diameter limit within PACs. We request that limit be set at no more than 18 inches dbh, as per the 2102 MSO Recovery Plan at 268. • Mechanical treatment should be limited to 20% of non-core PAC area within an EMU. <i>Id.</i> at 262. • Seasonal restrictions should be implemented. <i>Id.</i> • A robust monitoring program should be established. <i>Id.</i> • Prescribed fire should be allowed to enter core areas only if it is expected to burn with low fire severity and intensity. <i>Id.</i> at 263. • Within recovery foraging/non-breeding habitats, strive to retain trees greater than 24 inches dbh. <i>Id.</i> at 269. 	
14	Thank you for your consideration of these scoping comments. Please keep me apprised of any developments on the 4FRI Rim Country Project.	
Letter 33		Bradley Powell President Arizona Wildlife Federation
1	Please consider the following comments on the June 2016 Four Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI) Rim Country EIS Proposed Action.	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Project Objective, Purpose and Need - The AWF strongly supports the objective of the Rim Country Proposed Action “to reestablish and restore forest structure and pattern, forest health, and vegetation composition and diversity in ponderosa pine ecosystems to conditions within the natural range of variation, thus moving the project area toward the desired conditions. We believe that a healthier more resilient forest will provide more sustainable benefits to wildlife and to the citizens of Arizona.</p>	
2	<p>Place more emphasis on Wildlife - Arizona is blessed to be a sportsmen’s paradise. More than 2 million Arizona residents and nonresidents enjoy hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing here every year, contributing <u>\$2.4 billion to the state economy</u>. To ensure these traditions can be passed along to the next generation, sportsmen are actively restoring habitat across the state for elk, pronghorn, mule deer, quail, turkey, bighorn sheep, and native trout. The Proposed Action should include wildlife habitat restoration needs and actions for all species not just federally protected species. We also recommend that the Purpose and Need should be expanded to include “Support quality hunting and fishing opportunities”. The proposed action and treatments should emphasize actions that will improve terrestrial and aquatic habitat conditions, maintain/restore functioning wildlife migration corridors, and provide reasonable access. In addition, the Proposed Action should address increasing wildlife diversity by increasing spatial heterogeneity of habitat components for both aquatic and terrestrial wildlife.</p>	
3	<p>Emphasize wildlife waters - Many wildlife waters (including tanks, water collection aprons, drinkers, etc.) in the project area have been degraded or are no longer functioning due to damage from catastrophic wildfire or lack of maintenance. These waters need to be repaired (i.e., sediment removal) or replaced. For waters that are exclusively wildlife waters, exclusion fencing may need repair or replacement to keep livestock out. There are other areas of wildlife habitat that have been identified for the installation of new waters. These repairs, replacements, and installations will improve habitat for wildlife and improve wildlife distribution across the landscape.</p>	
4	<p>Emphasize wildlife connectivity and migration corridors - The State of Arizona participated a few years ago in a wildlife corridors project of the Western Governors Association. Maps of important corridors were developed and should be utilized in this analysis. An objective of the Proposed Action</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>should be to create and restore wildlife corridors through thinning to connect wildlife habitat blocks on the landscape. For example, emphasis should be placed on mechanical treatments that will maintain and/or restore montane meadow connectivity through the removal of trees, including juniper and large young trees where wildlife travel corridors have been identified. Within the Rim Country project area, fence improvements and modifications would benefit wildlife through increasing wildlife connectivity on the landscape. For example, unnecessary fences need to be removed to allow wildlife to move through important movement corridors between habitat blocks. There are also other fences that require repair to keep livestock within allotments and protect sensitive wildlife resources. Wildlife would also benefit from wildlife friendly modifications to other fences that would retain livestock while allowing wildlife to cross.</p>	
5	<p>Clarify the linkages between the Travel Management Plans and the Rim Country EIS - It is not clear to us how the Travel Management plan for the area will be coordinated with the Rim Country EIS. The proposed action details specific road decommissioning targets. If the Rim Country EIS intends to supersede the Travel Management planning process it should be clearly specified.</p>	
6	<p>Ensure that riparian areas and watersheds are adequately analyzed and protected - Some of the most storied and productive Coldwater fisheries in Arizona lie within the project area. These streams also provide vital water sources for thousands of people in the State. The project area is home to native Gila trout that are important from both a conservation and recreational perspective. We would like to see these water resources protected. The proposed forest restoration combined with thoughtful hydrologic rehabilitation can produce resilient, sustainable, and highly functioning watersheds that support both native and recreational fisheries. All perennial, ephemeral, or intermittent streams (not just those identified in Figure 6, page 19) should be considered for restoration and or improvements. Not all of these streams may need restoration or special treatment, but the EIS should provide the necessary guidance if restoration or special treatment is deemed appropriate. Prior to mechanical or fire restoration treatments, the hydrologic impacts of the treatment to streams, aquatic ecosystems, and riparian areas should be formally evaluated. Treatments</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	should be adjusted to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts when matched with complimentary hydrologic rehabilitation.	
7	Thank you for your work on restoring our National Forests and accepting our comments. Please contact me if you have questions or need additional information.	
Letter 34		Leslie Johnson Flying H Ranch
1	The project needs to drastically increase juniper treatment, as well as thin the Ponderosa pine, throughout the Tonto and other forests. For juniper treatment, herbicides, wood cutting (both commercial and for personal use), dozer pushes and prescribed fires all need to be used.	
2	There should be NO road closures. ALL roads are covered under the Travel Management plan and if you cannot maintain these roads, then the County or Game and Fish should as these roads are part of the infrastructure of the county and are essential for ranching operations, hunts, fishing, and recreation. The proposed action needs to be very specific, and not be proposed using generalities, so there is no question about what is being proposed on the ground.	
3	When any road is proposed to be closed or areas are to be affected by a new proposal, then the proposed action needs to use the USFS improvement number identify of the road or area (creek, tank, fence, meadow, etc.) under consideration.	
4	There should be no fencing done around waters for most waters in the forest are someone's private property right and fencing creates a bias act between domestic animals and wildlife.	
5	Affected permittees need to have a say in project area's before, not after, any action is proposed and their voice needs to be heard, as they are the main stakeholder in any proposed action.	
6	All work contracts need to be issued to U S contractors.	
Letter 35		John Johnson Flying H Ranch
1	The project needs to drastically increase juniper treatment throughout the Tonto and other forests. Herbicides, wood cutting (both commercial and for personal use), dozer pushes and prescribed fires all need to be used to control the juniper take over of many parts of the forests.	
2	There should be NO road closures. ALL roads are covered under the Travel Management plan and if you cannot maintain these roads, then the County or	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	Game and Fish should as these roads are part of the infrastructure of the county and are essential for ranching operations, hunts, fishing, and recreation.	
3	There should be no fencing done around waters for most waters in the forest are someone's private property right and is a bias act between domestic and wildlife.	
4	All permittees need to have a say in project area's before, not after, any action is proposed and all work contracts need to be issued to U S contractors.	
Letter 36		Jan Boyer
1	<p>These are my comments about your plan to burn and sell 2 million acres of Arizona forest:</p> <p>Please do not do this project.</p> <p>The potassium permanganate is too toxic and the toxins that the trees have been storing will be released. Also, every acre burned produces 4.81 tons of carbon = 14 tons of CO2.</p> <p>This is not sustainable and I want future generations to have forests. We can hardly breathe in Santa Fe from the burns in this area. The scale of what you are doing is criminal. Getting rid of 95% of the Ponderosa Pines is insane.</p>	
2	<p>There is a persistent belief, due to oft-repeated misinformation, that the U.S. Forest Service is thinning and burning “underbrush” on our public lands. Many express shock at the actual scale of prescribed burns.</p> <p>Tom Ribe’s recent op-ed (“Santa Fe must tackle overgrown forests,” My View, April 3) makes clear the scale of the Forest Service’s prescribed burning and logging agenda. Ribe bemoans the loss of 12,000 acres to fire, which is indeed tragic, and then goes on to call for the burning and clear-cut logging of more than 107,000 acres.</p> <p>We oppose the increasing aerial firebombing of our forests and wildlife.</p> <p>We are pro-forest, and we advocate for community decision-making on public land issues. New Mexico’s 99 percent who are not politically connected and wealthy have had no voice in decisions to sell off our forests to the burn and logging industries.</p>	
3	The Forest Service’s “comment” process is a bad joke. Anyone who objects to landscape-scale chemical burning and clear-cut logging is harassed out of public	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>meetings, disrespected and disregarded. There is no oversight nor community input in the shady underworld of prescribed burn contracting.</p> <p>I attend public meetings on prescribed burns, and I am appalled at what I see as the Forest Service’s unbridled hatred for forests and the democratic process. Workers never use the word “trees.” Only “excess fuel” and “timber.”</p>	
4	<p>Ribe and the Forest Service appeal to fear, not logic nor science. They warn against the “big fire” that has never happened in our watershed, while avoiding mention of the Cerro Grande Fire, a prescribed burn set by the National Park Service in May 2000. Ribe wrote a book calling it “America’s worst prescribed fire disaster.” More than 250 homes were destroyed, the entire city of Los Alamos was evacuated, and Los Alamos National Laboratory property burned. We’ll never know the numbers of wildlife lost, because no one cares to investigate.</p>	
5	<p>William Baker’s <i>Fire Ecology in Rocky Mountain Landscapes</i>, the definitive, 628-page, peer-reviewed scientific text on the subject, concludes that the best approach is not to try to change or control fire, but to learn to live with it. He argues that the most effective action is to limit and redesign human-forest interfaces to withstand fire, which can be done in ways that are beneficial to forests and human communities.</p>	
6	<p>The Forest Service has been intentionally ignoring current peer-reviewed science for decades. Why? Because current science tells us that prescribed burns make forests more — not less — likely to burn. But there is no money in leaving the forests alone. Instilling fear into the public serves the interests of the multibillion-dollar burn contracting industry.</p>	
Letter 37		Rob Marshall Nature Conservancy
1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Rim Country Project’s Proposed Action of the Four Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI). The Nature Conservancy (“Conservancy”) has actively supported forest restoration in Arizona for over 20 years, and is proud to be a strong partner with the U.S. Forest Service as they continue to address forest management needs at a scale that matches the scope of this critical issue.</p> <p>As a participating member of the 4FRI Stakeholder Group, we support the comments provided by this group as approved at the July 27, 2016 4FRI Stakeholder Group meeting. We focus our organization-specific comments here towards providing meaningful input that will help craft the Draft Environmental</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	Impact Statement (“Draft EIS”). We have divided our comments into three categories: 1) support for the Proposed Action (“PA”) document itself; 2) input designed to improve documentation and development of the Draft EIS; and 3) preparation for project implementation.	
2	<p>Support for the Proposed Action</p> <p>The Conservancy is in strong agreement with the overarching Purpose and Need embedded with the Proposed Action. We agree with the expressed desired conditions of a restored forest structure and pattern, improved forest health, and vegetation composition and diversity that reflect conditions within their natural ranges of variation. We do note that while your statement specifies ponderosa pine (PA p. 3), we understand that multiple vegetation types are being evaluated for restoration purposes (i.e. dry mixed conifer, grasslands, aspen, etc.). In addition, we are pleased to see focus on maintaining structural diversity such as snags and coarse woody debris for wildlife habitat complexity, as well as maintaining or improving aquatic habitats to meet needs for the variety of aquatic and riparian-dependent species. We also appreciate the increased attention on the economic conditions necessary to build a successful forest restoration effort in a timeframe that matters.</p>	
3	<p>Input for Draft EIS</p> <p>In taking this PA forward to the next step, that of developing and analyzing alternatives for the Draft EIS, we encourage the U.S. Forest Service to address consistency in use of terms, both within the PA and between this analysis process and the First EIS under 4FRI, and clarify concepts and treatment outcomes. As examples:</p>	
4	<p>a) Dry mixed conifer vs. mixed conifer vs. frequent-fire mixed conifer are often used to describe the same vegetation type.</p> <p>b) Old and large vs. larger/older vs. large and/or old trees are all used as descriptors and could cause confusion.</p>	
5	<p>c) The terms “high severity fire” and “active crown fire” seem to be used at different places to refer to essentially a similar condition—consistency (and definition) of terms such as these may be helpful in future documents.</p>	
6	<p>d) The concept of Natural Range of Variability (“NRV”) is mentioned in the Purpose section (PA, p. 3), but not referred to in the Desired Conditions. It may be helpful to both describe what NRV is for readers of the Draft EIS and also describe where and how we may not achieve NRV given socio-political and economic aspects of the restoration effort.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
7	<p>e) Tables 3 and 4, if translated into the Draft EIS, should have a clearer definition of “No Fire,” as well as have a column for “Surface Fire,” as the only options described are “No Fire” and two categories of “crown fire,” with the percentages not totaling 100%.</p> <p>f) “Brush” seems to be a non-technical term and is also not defined.</p> <p>g) Perhaps use different terms than “understocked” and “stocking levels” as they refer more to timber production than ecological conditions, particularly if the Draft EIS will use the Natural Range of Variability concept. As an example, paragraph 3 on page 8 of the PA could state “There are approximately 69,360 acres of national forest lands in the project area in need of <i>reforestation</i>, a term applying ecological needs for forest cover rather than wood production.</p>	
8	<p>h) Aspen restoration (PA, p. 26) includes, but does not provide adequate rationale for, removing aspen. This may cause confusion without explanation; does this mean “remove dead aspen” or is there another reason for aspen removal in areas targeted for aspen regeneration?</p>	
9	<p>i) Despite being in similar vegetation types, it may improve understanding of management differences for Mexican Spotted Owl (MSO) and Northern Goshawk (NOGO) treatments by separating their descriptive treatments.</p>	
10	<p>j) Reflecting upon the 4FRI First EIS, the objection process, and the resultant agreed-upon negotiation relative to MSO treatments, we suggest providing explicit support, rationale, and justification for MSO treatments that may have only been embedded within the Biological Opinion and not easily attainable by stakeholders during the EIS review process. Documenting the support and agreement between the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for proposed treatments needs to be a part of the Rim Country Project EIS.</p>	
11	<p>k) Planned protective barriers and fencing may need to be prioritized from both an economic feasibility and capacity standpoint.</p>	
12	<p>Preparation for Project Implementation</p> <p>We appreciate the increased emphasis in the Rim Country Project EIS on incorporating industry and socio-economic perspectives and needs. We applaud the U.S. Forest Service’s responsiveness in modifying planned contract implementation processes and schedules to better fit the current economic realities the small-diameter wood industries face. To continue that momentum into this next large analysis, we suggest that the Draft EIS analysis of mechanical treatment effects takes into account a variety of potential harvesting and biomass</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>removal scenarios and results on the environment. With the current economic analyses provided by Campbell Global of the C.C. Cragin treatment area, several innovative recommendations have emerged that could facilitate industry while modifying somewhat how harvested wood and residual biomass is removed. These ideas may have environmental effects (for example, allowing logs to dry out on site; leaving a certain percentage of biomass on site in various ways) that, without proper analysis, may not be allowed or supported during implementation of these proposed treatments.</p> <p>While understanding that any EIS is not a prescriptive guide to implementation, we would like to ensure that such flexibility is allowed under this analysis to the extent possible. Certain geographic areas distant from current—and even potential—economic working circles may have to incorporate such flexibility in order to achieve at least some threshold of restoration and catastrophic fire risk reduction. Disclosing effects of the suggestions made by Campbell Global, or by other stakeholders, may help maintain a flexible implementation process.</p> <p>This underscores the most fundamental need of forest restoration today. We are faced with an increasing urgency to address forest health or face the potential loss of a significant portion of our northern Arizona forests to uncharacteristically high-intensity wildfire. To achieve success in reducing that risk on a landscape scale, all parties—stakeholders, industry, and agency land managers—must be nimble, innovative, and flexible in trying out new ideas for both ecological treatments and economic scenarios.</p> <p>The Rim Country Project offers a chance to make a meaningful difference in a landscape that provides healthy watersheds and clean water for both humans and wildlife; economic engines for rural communities; and a quality of life for all Arizona residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Rim Country Proposed Action, and we look forward to the success of the Rim Country Project analysis and the continued restoration of our northern Arizona forests.</p>	
Letter 38		<p>Mary Fish There are some links in the e-mail that I did not open that looked like images. I recommend</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
		whomever is assigned these comments determine if they are relevant links or images.
1	<p>Looking at the project area, and reading the proposed plan I have concerns about some basic premises you have put forth, because I think they are based on misunderstandings, serious misunderstandings, and even as is admitted, inadequate knowledge to put forth such sweeping changes to such a large area of forest in a state easily characterized as a desert, where the forest is your most precious natural resource. First off, looking at the project area on google maps >> link << the cover is not excessively dense. In fact it looks like treecover is densest in valleys and stream beds, and sparser on upland areas, like mesas or ridges.</p> <p>On page 7 of the proposal you state, "The exclusion of fire has resulted in high canopy cover and high tree density which limits the amount of sunlight and precipitation reaching the ground. Consequently, understory vegetation is less diverse, sparse, and it provides poorer quality food and cover for wildlife than under more open canopies." I must beg to differ, as there is abundant evidence in satellite images that more open canopies do not result in more understory growth. Places where stands are at the desired density of or approaching 25% lack shade - shade is seldom a growth inhibiting, even deep shade in denser stands - and the ground is baked, caked and bare desert type shrubs are typical, if any. Where stands are denser (presumably 40-65%) there is snowcover on the ground, showing precipitation dows reach the understory. Needle leaved trees usually permit this, not limiting the percipitation reaching the ground by very much at all.</p>	
2	<p>view from upper tonto creek campground view of same from google earth, note trees stands are thin away from waterways, which require shading from same trees if they're not to dry up.</p>	
3	<p>view from paleo site monument google earth view of same, tree cover is moderate to marginal</p>	
4	<p>Knoll Lake Campground note on the map, tree density within the campground is similar to the surrounding forest >> link</p>	
5	<p>Clint's Well Campground, again stand density (Google Earth image) is similar to what is found in the Knoll Lake area, and across this part of the rim. It's</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	reassuring that this stand density allows snowcover on the forest floor, so tanks, streams and other aquifers can be recharged.	
6	<u>Chevelon Canyon Lake Campground</u> <u>Earth view</u> shows sparser and stunted trees outside the canyons in this northern part of the project area.	
7	<p>Not in the project are but serves well to illustrate, please observe how <u>just east of Show Low</u> how areas with denser tree cover correlate to more tanks, streams and water features. (Zoom in and pan for detail.)</p> <p>The supposition that 25% tree cover is desirable is a highly questionable and unproven premise, especially in a state that is largely desert already.</p> <p>Such a low density canopy will likely diminish the penetration of precipitation into the earth, harming the recharging of springs and aquifers. Victor Schauberger, who was a forester in Austria more than a hundred years ago, understood the desirable effect of designing a positive temperature differential between the ground and surface precip to activate the <u>subterranean part of the hydrological cycle that restores underground aquifers</u> and creates or sustains springs.</p>	
8	With no tree cover, all the water cycles between surface and atmosphere. temperature differential affects water's penetration into the soil >> Schauberger showed that because water was most dense at 4 degrees C, when the precip was at that temperature or higher, it could only penetrate into soil which was cooler; if precip was less than 4 deg. C, only warmer ground allowed its penetration into the soil. Ofcourse if ground is frozen, there is no penetration.	
9	Adequate shading by trees is not only essential for groundwater preservation/restoration, it is also critical for preventing salting/alkalizing of soils, and avertering the proliferation of pathogens and other lower level organisms in the environment.	
10	<u>A little about Victor Schauberger, and water temperature's effect on pathogens</u> - skip to about 7 minutes if you like it shorter.	
11	Although I can't know how severely the bark beetles or their fungi, or mistletoe are haming the trees, and I understand the concern here, I feel some test plots are in order to verify that what you're proposing isn't going to inflict extraordinary damage by side effects from radically heating the environment beyond the forest systems' tolerance levels or ability to recover.	
12	Lastly, I would like you to limit prescribed fire burn tonnage or acreage, perhaps to half or less of what you propose, and not use any chemicals in starting or	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>sustaining the controlled burns, because whenever there is a forest fire out west, all the pollution picks up into the jet stream and dumps on the midwest, and its more toxic and miserable in terms of health effects, for all ages of folk, than you might realize. What measures are in place to ensure your prescribed burns don't get out of control?</p> <p>thank you,</p>	
Letter 39		Bruce Fox
1	<p>In response to the invitation I received on June 21, 2016, please find below my comments on the 4FRI Rim Country Project Proposed Action.</p> <p>For context, I earned a Bachelor of Science in Forestry, a Master of Forestry, and a Ph.D. in Natural Resources and have a total of over 30 years of experience in forestry in the public and private sectors, including private industry management and planning, forestry consulting, teaching and research in higher education, and with the USDA Forest Service. In addition, I am a California Registered Professional Forester.</p> <p>Based on my review of the Proposed Action document, I have the following nine comments:</p>	
2	<p>1. Although the Scoping document does identify very broad target desired conditions (Table 7) the specific desired forest conditions that meet the stated proposed action goal "...to restore forest resiliency and ecosystem function in ponderosa pine forests..." (Proposed Action, page 1) are not specified. Instead Table 7 displays very broad ranges of target conditions based on basal area per acre (that has, unfortunately, no units of measure specified), trees per acre, and stand density index. Applying such ranges to a stand could result in extremely different stand structures and thus very different desired conditions;</p>	
3	<p>2. No criteria are provided as to how to select stands for particular treatments;</p>	
4	<p>3. No references exist to the literature that constitutes "...best available science" used—or is planned to be used--to develop prescriptions, "sustainability", or desired future conditions;</p>	
5	<p>4. Except in the broadest sense, no specification of targets (<i>e.g.</i> acres in a particular condition class) for "sustainability" is included in the document;</p>	
6	<p>5. The document contains little or no reference to how the Proposed Action will "Preserve cultural resources" or "Support sustainable forest products industries" (Scoping Document, page 3);</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
7	6. The document contains no mention of monitoring to help ensure that activities attain the goals of the project;	
8	7. The treatment types described on pages 22-25 do not contain any quantifiable target for initial treatments nor quantifiable desired future conditions that these treatments are desired to accomplish;	
9	8. The “socio-political importance” of large trees mentioned on pages 4 and 5, is not explained, making the reason for retaining “...as many large trees as possible...” unclear; and	
10	9. A relatively minor point is that the “All Ponderosa Pine No Fire” value (2%) in Table 7 appears incorrect. If 49.96% of the acres have a 0% value for “No Fire” and the other 50.04% only has 1% “No Fire”, arithmetically the Total Value cannot equal 2%.	
Letter 40		Woody Cline
1	The project needs to increase the acres of treatment in the juniper vegetation. Treatment options have to include fuel wood harvest and pushing with dozers.	
2	There should not be any decommissioning of forest roads in this project, all the roads are covered under travel mngt. The proposed action has to be more specific on roads to be closed, exclosures around streams and meadow, etc.	
4	Project needs to disclose road numbers, stream and spring locations and meadow locations.	
5	There should not be any fencing done around springs, etc. This effects cattle grazing and our wildlife.	
6	The 4FRI project needs to be awarded to a US company, note one from outside the US.	
7	Effectted permittees have to be involved in this process.	
Letter 41		Todd Schulke Center For Biological Diversity
1	This letter responds to the June 27, 2016 notice of intent (“NOI”) to prepare an environmental impact statement (“EIS”) for the Rim Country Project (“project”) of the Four Forest Restoration Initiative (“4FRI”) in the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto national forests. 81 Fed. Reg. 41,547-48. The Center for Biological Diversity (“Center”) is a non-profit, public interest organization with more than 48,000 members dedicated to conservation and recovery of fauna and flora at-risk of extinction. As a founding stakeholder in the 4FRI, the Center is part of a broad social consensus that supports active restoration of ponderosa	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>pine forest to improve resilience of ecological systems suffering chronic stress that results from effects of past management and climate change.</p>	
2	<p>Purpose and need</p> <p>There need for ecological restoration of dry conifer forests in northern Arizona is clear. Management that followed European settlement in the mid-19th century made forests less resilient to natural disturbance. Logging destroyed large trees that naturally resist fire injury. Livestock grazing and fire exclusion promoted forest structure packed with small trees that compete with other native plants for limited water and soil nutrients. Herbivorous animals and their predators suffer as a result. Chronic drought and warming temperatures make it increasingly likely that extensive stand-replacing fires will compound these changes to ecosystem composition with vegetation type conversions. Without action to restore the fire regime and recover mature forest structure, the Forest Service manages for high-intensity fires that outrun suppression resources in extreme weather, creating unnecessary expense and unacceptable risk to human life and resource values.</p> <p>Logging, livestock grazing and fire exclusion created the conditions that now require ecological restoration (Covington and Moore 1994). Climate change underlines the urgency of restoration (Seager and Vecchi 2010, Williams et al. 2010). To accomplish restoration in dry conifer forests, dormant fire regimes must be revived (Allen et al. 2002, DellaSala et al. 2004, Falk et al. 2006, Noss et al. 2006). Benefits of fire should be central to the purpose and need of the project. A coherent restoration strategy will identify opportunities to use fire at landscape and watershed scales, and then prescribe site-specific vegetation treatments that support the strategy (Peterson and Johnson 2007).</p> <p>The Center has repeatedly commented to the Forest Service in context of similar projects that it is necessary to inform proposed actions with landscape-scale assessment of opportunities to manage unplanned natural ignitions for resource benefits. Vegetation treatments must be efficiently located and prioritized to support fire use in the long-term. We expect the Forest Service to supply in the EIS reasons why the location, timing and intensity of proposed actions will support a coherent restoration strategy. Vegetation treatments may improve options for ecological restoration, but they do not guarantee a positive result (<i>e.g.</i>, Brown et al. 2004, Elliot et al. 2010, McGlone et al. 2009, Mitchell et al. 2009, Naficy et al. 2010). The EIS should candidly assess how the proposed</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>action may fail to meet the purpose and need. For example, if treatments increase the effectiveness of fire suppression then the EIS should disclose potentially significant impacts to the environment that may result (Backer et al. 2004).</p>	
3	<p>Fuel treatments</p> <p>The intensity of wildland fire behavior and the severity of its physical and biological effects depend, in part, on fuel properties and their spatial arrangement. Fuel bed structure is central to an effective management strategy because it influences fire spread potential (Graham et al. 2004). All things equal, the bulk density of ground fuels (<i>e.g.</i>, grasses, shrubs, litter and duff, and downed woody material) influences surface fire behavior more than fuel load (<i>i.e.</i>, weight per unit area) (Agee 1996, Sandberg et al. 2001). In turn, the intensity of surface fire behavior dictates the likelihood of tree crown ignition and torching behavior (Scott and Reinhardt 2001). In our observation, the Forest Service has never distinguished ground fuel density and fuel load in environmental analysis of potential fire behavior, and it should clearly distinguish the two in this EIS to ensure professional integrity.</p> <p>The density, composition and structure of live fuels above the ground, namely tall shrubs and small trees, also affect potential fire behavior as “ladders” that facilitate vertical fire spread from the ground surface into tree canopies. The size of the spatial gap that separates ground fuel and ladder fuel from crown fuel strongly influences crown ignition potential (Graham et al. 2004). Van Wagner (1977) established that torching crowns (<i>i.e.</i>, passive crown fire) <u>only</u> if the rate of horizontal fire spread exceeds a crown fuel density threshold that varies with slope angle and wind speed. Predictions about fuel treatment effects to crown fire hazard (<i>i.e.</i>, potential for active crown fire) depend on measurement of crown bulk density (Perry et al. 2004). In our observation, the Forest Service has never validated its assumptions about potential fire behavior with site-specific analysis of crown bulk density, canopy base height, slope position and angle, and prevailing wind patterns. It should ensure professional integrity with accurate sampling and reporting of field data to corroborate assumptions, and clearly explain the methodology applied to modeling of potential fire behavior. We encourage the Forest Service to model fire behavior in at least two different weather scenarios (<i>e.g.</i>, 80th and 95th percentile conditions) to compare the effects of action alternatives and support an informed decision.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Accurate assessment of vegetation treatment effects on the likelihood of crown fire ignition and spread requires the Forest Service to consider: (1) surface fuel density and arrangement, (2) canopy base height, (3) crown bulk density, (4) local topography, and (5) prevailing weather patterns (Graham et al. 2004, Hunter et al. 2007). The first three factors can be managed to affect the likelihood of crown fire ignition and spread without resort to large tree removal (Fielder and Keegan 2002, Keyes and O’Hara 2002, Perry et al. 2004, Pollett and Omi 2002). Omi and Martinson (2002) measured effects of vegetation treatments on fire severity and correlated canopy base height with “stand damage” by wildfire. Importantly, that study did <u>not</u> detect any correlation of crown bulk density with observed fire effects:</p> <p>[H]eight to live crown, the variable that determines crown fire initiation rather than propagation, had the strongest correlation to fire severity in the areas we sampled ... [W]e also found the more common stand descriptors of stand density and basal area to be important factors. But especially crucial are variables that determine tree resistance to fire damage, such as diameter and height. Thus, “fuel treatments” that reduce basal area or density from above (i.e., removal of the largest stems) will be ineffective within the context of wildfire management.</p> <p>Omi and Martinson (2002: 22). The Center has repeatedly commented based on these findings, which were funded by and reported to the Joint Fire Science Program, and other peer-reviewed research that large trees promote fire resistance in treated stands (Arno 2000) and treating fuels “from below” by increasing canopy base height “yields the most direct and effective impact” to potential fire behavior (Keyes and O’Hara 2002: 107). Omi and Martinson (2002) also noted the incompatibility of open forest conditions created by vegetation treatments designed to maximize horizontal discontinuity of canopy fuels with equally important objectives to conserve habitat for sensitive wildlife and prevent rapid understory initiation and ladder fuel development. The EIS should give due attention to these important factors.</p>	
4	<p>Mechanical logging operations usually create large quantities of activity-created slash fuel by relocating tree stems, branches and needles from the canopy to the ground surface (Graham et al. 2004, Stephens 1998, van Wagendonk 1996). Logging slash promotes more intense fire behavior than any other fuel type (e.g., Dodge 1972, Stephens and Moghaddas 2005). According to the Congressional Research Service,</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Timber harvesting removes the relatively large diameter wood that can be converted into wood products, but leaves behind the small material, especially twigs and needles. The concentration of these “fine fuels” on the forest floor increases the rate of spread of wildfires. Thus, one might expect acres burned to be positively correlated with timber harvest volume.</p> <p>The proposed action may add 15 tons per acre of slash fuel to the ground surface, or more, depending on pre-treatment forest structure, and make unplanned wildfires more difficult to control where activity fuels are not effectively managed. Van Wagtendonk (1996) modeled the effectiveness of “low thinning” combined with a pile-and-burn slash treatment on flat ground. It yielded nearly identical fire behavior as thinning without <u>any</u> slash treatment because surface fuels that existed prior to the treatment were not reduced. In the same simulation, lop-and-scatter treatments of logging slash “significantly increased subsequent fire behavior” by leaving on the ground a dense surface fuel bed (van Wagtendonk 1996: 1160). Activity slash fuels may persist for decades:</p> <p>In both even aged and un-even aged treatments, it is often assumed that harvest related slash will decompose over time thereby reducing fire hazards. In reality, logging slash may persist for long periods, and therefore, will influence fire hazards for extended periods. Rates of woody fuel decay are highly variable (Lahio and Prescott, 2004). The rates of decomposition of understory fuels are primarily dependant upon several factors including temperature, soil moisture, insect activity, and material size (Lahio and Prescott, 2004). Decaying conifer activity fuels have been reported to persist for 30 years in xeric forest environments (Stephens, 2004).</p> <p>(Stephens and Moghaddas 2005: 377). To solve the dilemma posed by creation of slash fuel in mechanical vegetation treatments, prescribed burning is recommended as the <u>only</u> treatment that effectively reduces activity fuels <u>and</u> pre-existing surface fuels below the pre-treatment condition (Stephens 1998, van Wagtendonk 1996). Burning is uniquely effective because fire consumes the finest and most ignitable woody fuels that pose the greatest hazard of fire ignition and spread (Deeming 1990). In the proposed action, much but not all of the project area would be treated by prescribed fire. The EIS should describe the intensity and timing of proposed activity slash fuel treatments and candidly disclose the effectiveness of treatment options. The Center will object to a draft</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>decision that includes mechanical-only vegetation treatments uncoupled to burning because they will make fires more erratic and difficult to control, endanger public safety, and undermine the purpose and need.</p>	
5	<p>The EIS should disclose potentially significant effects of the proposed action to public health and safety, including wildland fire control efforts (<i>e.g.</i>, Backer et al. 2004). It should give a hard look to post-logging fuel density and structure, and characterize fire hazard at fine scales, particularly on steep slopes where prescribed fire may not be used, rather than generalizing them across the project area. Again, analysis assumptions should be corroborated by site-specific data collected in the field, and the methodology applied to modeling potential fire behavior should be clearly described in plain English so that the public may meaningfully comment.</p> <p>The direction of potential fire spread (<i>i.e.</i>, backing, flanking or heading) is an important consideration in treatment design because fire interacts with weather, topography and vegetation to “back” and “flank” around certain conditions, or “head” through others, with distinctive environmental effects (Graham et al. 2004). For example, steep slopes facilitate wind-driven convection currents that drive radiant heat upward and bring flames nearer to unburned vegetation, pre-heating fuels and amplifying fire intensity as it heads upslope (Whelan 1995). Severe fire effects often concentrate at upper slope positions and on ridges, but are relatively rare on the lee side of slopes that do not directly receive frontal wind (Finney 2001). Therefore, fuel treatments should be oriented with prevailing spatial patterns of fire spread in mind. Fire behavior modeling is helpful at illustrating potential fire spread patterns, but it must be corroborated by site-specific field data. Modeling is such a technical exercise that its inclusion in an EIS may defeat the purpose of NEPA if its methodology is not clearly explained.</p> <p>Overlapping fuel treatments that reduce fuel continuity can fragment severe fire effects into small patches if they disrupt heading fire behavior and maximize the area burned by flanking and backing fires (Finney 2001). Slope aspects facing away from frontal or diurnal winds are a lesser treatment priority because backing fires are the most likely to exhibit mild intensity and effects, consistent with the purpose and need.</p> <p>An additional approach to the strategic location of fuel treatments is to identify landscape features that are currently resistant to severe fire effects and use them</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>as anchor points for a landscape fire management strategy. Such features may include natural openings, meadows, open ridges, riparian areas, mature forest patches on gentle slopes, and areas where fuel treatments already have been completed. Using those features to support fire use will maximize the efficiency of restoration efforts. Moreover, identification of those features in the design of vegetation treatments will facilitate emergency application of confinement and containment strategies as alternatives to full control, and provide safe areas for workers to ignite prescribed fires for hazard reduction. The EIS should consider such factors.</p>	
6	<p>Desired conditions</p> <p>This project is the first instance when desired conditions advanced by the revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (USDA 2015a) and site-specific treatment prescriptions developed by the Forest Service have surfaced for public discussion in the context of the 4FRI. Because the desired conditions of the Forest Plan are new, and never were subject to collaborative planning by the 4FRI stakeholders, they merit a hard look in the EIS at effects to the environment with comparison of reasonable alternatives, as described below.</p> <p>According to the environmental impact statement supporting the revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (USDA 2015b), desired conditions for ponderosa pine and dry mixed conifer forest come from an item of grey literature (Reynolds et al. 2013) that the Forest Service never subjected to blind peer review. Most of the information used by Reynolds and others (2013) to describe desired conditions for dry conifer forest comes from studies accomplished on the Mogollon Plateau south of the Colorado River (<i>e.g.</i>, Abella and Denton 2009, Bakker and Mast 2007, Biondi 1996, Fulé et al. 1997, Mast et al. 1999, Pearson 1950, Sanchez Meador et al. 2009, Sanchez Meador et al. 2010, Sanchez Meador et al. 2011, White 1985), in eastern Arizona, New Mexico and southern Colorado (<i>e.g.</i>, Boyden et al. 1995, Brown and Wu 2005, Cooper 1960, Cooper 1961, Swetnam and Baisan 1996), or else outside of the Southwestern Region (<i>e.g.</i>, Larson and Churchill 2012, Mast and Veblen 1999, Taylor 2010, Taylor and Skinner 2003, Woodall 2000). The body of information used by Reynolds and others (2013: 12-13; Table 4) speaks for itself. Reynolds and others (2013: 12) admit uncertainty about desired (or “reference”) conditions for dry conifer forest resulting from a paucity of supporting information and geographic imbalance of accessible data:</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>[T] here is a clear need for additional reference condition data sets, including sites from a wider spectrum across environmental gradients (e.g., soils, moisture, elevations, slopes, aspects) occupied by frequent-fire forests in the Southwest, especially in dry mixed-conifer. While the quantity of reference data sets is increasing, existing data represent a largely unbalanced sampling across gradients (e.g., most data sets are from basaltic soils and on dry to typical plant associations), and there have been few studies quantitatively examining and reporting spatial patterns of trees and the sizes and shapes of grass-forb-shrub interspaces.</p> <p>Their approach to managing uncertainty is to <i>blur</i> site-specific forest variation and <i>scale up</i> reference conditions to broad landscapes with a generic “natural range of variability” (Reynolds et al. 2103: 11):</p> <p>The natural range of variability can be estimated by pooling reference conditions across sites within a forest type. Reference conditions for a forest type typically vary from site to site due to differences in factors such as soil, elevation, slope, aspect, and micro-climate and manifests as differences in fire effects, tree densities, patterns of tree establishment and persistence, and numbers and dispersion of snags and logs. When pooled, these sources of variability comprise the natural range of variability of a site or forest type.</p> <p>The structure and composition of dry conifer forest is influenced by available moisture and soil chemistry (Abella and Covington 2006), as well as by variations in fire frequency mediated by topography, weather and climate (Odion et al. 2014, Swetnam and Baisan 1996, Williams and Baker 2012). It follows that variability of forest structure, composition and disturbance pattern is place-specific and cannot be generalized over broad landscapes or timeframes (Agee 1993, DellaSala et al. 2004). Ecologists stress the importance of locally-specific reference conditions to justify restoration goals and monitor outcomes recognizing that ecological patterns and need for restoration are scale-dependent (Noss 1985, Swetnam et al. 1999, White and Walker 1997).</p> <p>Desired conditions for dry conifer forest in the revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (USDA 2015a) are <u>not</u> specific to the project area. They fail to address scientific uncertainty and qualified disagreement among experts about forest ecology and management in the Southwestern Region (<i>see</i> USDI 2015b). In particular, desired conditions</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>advanced by the new Forest Plan do not: (1) account for historical variability in forest structure, composition or pattern, (2) establish a scientifically credible reference condition for restoration, or (3) prioritize management actions that will facilitate ecological restoration of fire-adapted forest ecosystems. Indeed, close inspection of place-specific information reveals that Reynolds and others (2013) selectively interpreted it to make a poorly supported case for sustained mechanical intervention (<i>i.e.</i>, logging) as a surrogate for restoration of natural fire regimes. It is appropriate to test the applicability of Forest Plan desired conditions to the project area with available information that documents its ecological distinctiveness.</p> <p>Williams and Baker (2012) quantified forest structure and disturbance patterns in dry conifer forest of the project area using historical land survey data and corroborated the findings with information from tree ring studies. They determined that ponderosa pine forest was structurally variable in 1880, and “park-like” only on <u>some</u> of the Mogollon Plateau and Black Mesa landscapes in the project area. A mixed-severity fire regime was common prior to 1880, and contemporary fires that include severe physical and biological effects to vegetation and soil are not outside of the natural range of variability (Odion et al. 2014, Williams and Baker 2012). That reconstruction of landscape pattern based on General Land Office (“GLO”) survey data more extensively sampled the Mogollon Plateau than any other landscape in the western United States (area = 405,214 ha) (Williams and Baker 2012: 5 (Table 1)). In 1880, approximately 25 percent of the Mogollon Plateau and Black Mesa landscapes (area = 151,080 ha), respectively, exhibited dry conifer forest with tree densities exceeding 178 stems per hectare (72 trees/acre). Dense forest structure was evenly distributed across each landscape and only somewhat concentrated on the southeast portion of the Mogollon Plateau (Williams and Baker 2012: Fig. 2). Notably, dense forest (>178 stems/ha⁻¹) on parts of the Mogollon Plateau coincided with observed “high” severity fire effects on vegetation (Williams and Baker 2012: Fig. 3).</p> <p>Observable severe fire effects also occurred in areas with lower tree density on the northwest portion of the Black Mesa landscape. An implication of this research is that desired conditions in the new Forest Plan (USDA 2015a) may inappropriately generalize historical structure, composition and fire regime of ponderosa pine and dry mixed conifer forest in the project area. Another implication is that desired conditions in the Forest Plan overlook the ecological</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>importance of the mixed-severity fire regime that preceded European settlement of the project area (DellaSala and Hanson 2015, Odion et al. 2014).</p> <p>Climate warming and chronic drought will produce novel environmental conditions in the project area that have not been observed from dendrochronological records (Seager and Vecchi 2010, Williams et al. 2010). Moreover, invasion of annual grasses accelerated by forest management will, in some instances, cause ecosystem structure, composition and dynamics to diverge from desired conditions (Bradley 2009, Brooks et al. 2004, McGlone et al. 2009). Therefore, it is reasonable to expect new biotic adaptations to climate change (Malcolm et al. 2002, Millar and Woolfendon 1999, Reinhardt et al. 2008, Seager et al. 2007, Weng and Jackson 1999). Ecological restoration oriented to attainment of historical conditions is not sustainable (Millar and Woolfendon 1999, Noss et al. 2006, Swetnam et al. 1999). Johnson and Duncan (2007) propose a “future range of variability” to account for inevitable ecological change as disturbance regimes and vegetation patterns track climate trends. An active fire regime will regulate ecosystem structure and composition in equilibrium with climate (Falk et al. 2006).</p> <p>Current forest density and composition are not likely to persist in the emerging environment because climate warming and weed invasions also make extensive stand-replacing fires more likely to occur (Running 2006). However, the degree to which inevitable change merits intensive manipulation of forest structure by mechanical means, as proposed in this project, is not certain (e.g., Naficy et al. 2010, Odion et al. 2014). Structure and composition of fire-adapted forests reflect underlying ecological processes (Allen et al. 2002, Falk et al. 2006). Current unsustainable conditions reflect the absence of natural fire disturbance (Covington and Moore 1994). Therefore, fire use should be the desired condition (Brown et al. 2004, DellaSala et al. 2004). In other words, desired conditions for dry conifer forest should emphasize resilience to inevitable fire disturbance that will increase in frequency and severity as climate exhibits a warming trend (McKenzie et al. 2004, Seager et al. 2007, Seager and Vecchi 2010, Weng and Jackson 1999, Westerling et al. 2006, Williams et al. 2010). A process-centered approach to restoration (e.g., Falk et al. 1996) is more likely to accomplish the purpose and need than one that mimics imagined structural patterns of a historic condition (e.g., Reynolds et al. 2013).</p>	
7	<p>Fulé and Laughlin (2007) quantified effects of wildland fire use to forest structure and composition on the Kaibab Plateau in northern Arizona, outside of</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>the project area. The Fire Management Plan of Grand Canyon National Park (USDI 2009) emphasizes fire use to accomplish resilience of natural systems and restricts mechanical tree harvesting to a limited area designated as “interface.” Fulé and Laughlin (2007) determined that fire use events in 2003 affected sufficient area to permit reliable statistical inference that physical and biological effects resulting from naturally-ignited wildfires supported reference conditions for ponderosa pine forest. They noted significant reductions of tree density, canopy cover and fuel load on burned sites compared to sites that did not burn. Those results demonstrate that “thinning effects” of fire in ponderosa pine forest, even after fire had been excluded since 1880, was consistent with restoration objectives related to forest structure (Fulé and Laughlin 2007: 144).</p> <p>Scientifically credible reference conditions for ecological restoration of dry conifer forest include a mosaic of tree patches of variable ages, sizes and densities, a robust and diverse herbaceous understory, frequent low-intensity surface fires ignited by lightning, and occasional stand-replacing fires at mid-scales (~10 to 100 acres). Management of ponderosa pine forest should reduce density of trees in smaller size classes that emerged due to management history, disrupt vertical connectivity in forest canopies (<i>i.e.</i>, canopy base height) at site and mid-scales (1 to 100 acres) to minimize torching fire behavior, restore surface fire with expectation of <u>some</u> active canopy fire behavior at mid-scales, and increase herbaceous ground cover. Reference conditions for ponderosa pine forest outlined here differ from desired conditions in the revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (USDA 2015a), which rely on Reynolds and others (2013). The biggest difference is that the Forest Service proposes intensive mechanical treatments, whereas this analysis agrees with the National Park Service (USDI 2009) and Fulé and Laughlin (2007) that fire use can be effective as a primary management tool in ponderosa pine forest where existing forest structure is fire resistant (<i>i.e.</i>, in large tree groups) despite a history of management-imposed fire exclusion.</p> <p>Mixed conifer forest is transitional among ponderosa pine and spruce-fir communities. With inherently diverse species composition and structure, mixed conifer forests exhibit an intermediate fire regime including low-severity surface fires and stand-replacing fires that maintain a patchy mosaic of forest structure over broad scales (Odion et al. 2014, Williams and Baker 2012). According to Fulé and others (2003: 483-484), the fire regime of mixed conifer forest varies by slope and aspect at very small spatial scales:</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>The transition zone studied here, changing from surface to stand-replacing fires, may be the most complex case for fire regime reconstruction ... [E]ven if we were fully able to reconstruct the details of every fire from 1700 to 1879, the pattern of severe burning did not appear to be stable over the spatial and temporal scale of the study. These considerations imply that managers may be best advised to view the historical condition in high-elevation southwestern forests as a relatively general guide to reference conditions, in contrast to the more specific and temporally stable reference data available for lower-elevation ponderosa pine forests.</p>	
8	<p>Elevated density of small, shade-tolerant, and fire-intolerant tree species (<i>e.g.</i>, white fir) is an artifact of fire suppression in some mixed conifer forests that creates more homogenous forest structure and promotes high-intensity fire behavior in extreme weather conditions (Fulé et al. 2003), but the effect of fire suppression is not uniform at mid-scales (10 to 100 acres). We recommend limiting vegetation treatments in mixed conifer forest to the driest sites (<i>i.e.</i>, south and west aspects) where fire suppression is most likely to have changed forest composition and structure relative to natural rotation in the fire regime. Treatments should reduce the density of small stems of shade-tolerant species and increase canopy base height to disrupt vertical fuel continuity so that surface fires are less likely to initiate crown fires. More aggressive treatments in mixed conifer forest, particularly at mesic locations (<i>e.g.</i>, north aspects and riparian areas) are almost certain to degrade recovery habitat of threatened Mexican spotted owl with uncertain and controversial effects to conservation and recovery of that species (USDI 1995, USDI 2012).</p>	
9	<p>Large trees</p> <p>Large trees that historically dominated forest structure in the project area were destroyed by past logging (Covington and Moore 1994). The ecological significance of large trees is amply documented (<i>e.g.</i>, Friederici 2003, Kaufmann et al. 1992). Large tree removal is not necessary to accomplish restoration of fire-adapted forest ecosystems (Arno 2000, Allen et al. 2002, Brown et al. 2004, Noss et al. 2005). Indeed, it is counterproductive.</p> <p>Live conifer stems larger than 16-inches diameter are rare at a landscape scale. Trees larger than 16-inches diameter comprise approximately three percent (3%) of ponderosa pine forests in Arizona and New Mexico, according to Forest Service data (USDA 1999, USDA 2007). The same data indicate that more than</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source										
	<p>eighty-two percent (82%) of ponderosa pines in the region are smaller than 11-inches diameter; approximately ninety-six percent (96%) are smaller than 15-inches; and less than one-tenth of one percent (.01%) are larger than 21-inches (Table 1). Clearly, the size distribution of trees is heavily skewed toward small-diameter stems, and this condition is dramatically different from historical conditions (Fulé et al. 1997).</p> <p>Table 1. Tree size class distribution in southwestern ponderosa pine forests.</p> <hr/> <table border="1" data-bbox="520 560 1402 901"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="520 560 1081 625">Size class</th> <th data-bbox="1081 560 1402 625">Distribution</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="520 625 1081 690">< 11 inches dbh</td> <td data-bbox="1081 625 1402 690">82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="520 690 1081 755">< 15 inches dbh</td> <td data-bbox="1081 690 1402 755">96%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="520 755 1081 820">> 16 inches dbh</td> <td data-bbox="1081 755 1402 820">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="520 820 1081 901">> 21 inches dbh</td> <td data-bbox="1081 820 1402 901">0.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <hr/> <p><u>Source:</u> Forest Inventory and Analysis National Program Forest Inventory Data Online (FIDO). http://www.fia.fs.fed.us/tools-data/</p> <p>The Forest Service should develop action alternatives that generally retain large trees. The agency is in possession of the collaborative <i>Old Growth Protection and Large Tree Retention Strategy</i> (“Strategy”) developed by public stakeholders, including the Center, for implementation in 4FRI projects. The Strategy is an “agreement-based outcome and product” developed in recognition that “translation of such agreement greatly enhances chances for success, and reduces the risk of conflict.” Given the enormous commitment of stakeholder time and energy to development of the Strategy, and its clear relevance and applicability to the project area, it is reasonable to develop action alternatives based on the Strategy.</p>	Size class	Distribution	< 11 inches dbh	82%	< 15 inches dbh	96%	> 16 inches dbh	3%	> 21 inches dbh	0.1%	
Size class	Distribution											
< 11 inches dbh	82%											
< 15 inches dbh	96%											
> 16 inches dbh	3%											
> 21 inches dbh	0.1%											

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>The Strategy is a reasonable alternative in this project for three reasons. First, it meets the purpose and need by actively managing hazardous fuels and forest structure, and it specifically allows for removal of large trees in limited circumstances, as distinct from a broad “diameter cap.”¹ Second, the Strategy avoids significant cumulative impacts that may result from unnecessary removal of fire-resistant trees, which are deficient compared to historic conditions (Covington and Moore 1994, Fulé et al. 1997, USDA 1999, USDA 2007). Finally, it mitigates adverse effects to wildlife species that require closed canopy forest habitat for essential life behaviors.</p> <p>Retention of large trees is fundamentally important to fire resistance of treated stands (DellaSala et al. 2004). Large ponderosa pine trees feature relatively thick bark and insulated buds that promote resistance to heat injury (Weaver 1951). Mature ponderosa pines feature high branch structure and open canopies, which discourage torching behavior (Keeley and Zedler 1998). Moreover, large ponderosa pine trees are capable of surviving crown scorch (McCune 1988). Therefore, large tree structure enhances forest resilience to severe fire effects (Arno 2000, Omi and Martinson 2002, Pollett and Omi 2002), whereas removing them may undermine fire resilience (Brown et al. 2004, Naficy et al. 2010). Large trees are the most difficult of all elements of forest structure to replace once removed (Agee and Skinner 2005).</p> <p>Research demonstrates <u>no</u> advantage to fire hazard mitigation resulting from treatments that remove large trees compared to treatments that retain them. Modeled treatments that removed only trees smaller than 16-inches diameter were marginally <u>more</u> effective at reducing long-term fire hazard than so-called “comprehensive” treatments that removed trees in all size classes (Fiedler and Keegan 2003). Thinning small trees and pruning branches of large trees to increase canopy base height significantly decreased the likelihood of crown fire initiation in many studies (Graham et al. 2004, Keyes and O’Hara 2002, Omi and Martinson 2002, Perry et al. 2004, Pollett and Omi 2002). Crown fire initiation is a precondition to active crown fire behavior (Agee 1996, Graham et al. 2004, Van Wagner 1977). Therefore, low thinning and underburning to reduce surface</p>	

¹ The 4FRI stakeholders expressly developed the Strategy to avoid reliance on strict diameter-limits while addressing the significant issues of old growth protection and large tree retention in ponderosa pine and mixed conifer forest restoration treatments. The Strategy identifies circumstances, ecological objectives and selection criteria for cutting large trees under site-specific conditions.

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>and ladder fuels at strategic locations will effectively reduce fire hazard at a landscape scale and meet the purpose and need.</p> <p>A variety of factors other than logging may affect the persistence of large trees. Prescribed fire can injure tree roots that have migrated into accumulated duff layers and cause post-treatment mortality among large trees (Sackett et al. 1996). Burning of pine stands with high surface fuel density (<i>e.g.</i>, slash fuel) can result in large tree mortality due to cambial injury (Hunter et al. 2007). High-intensity burns also may render large trees susceptible to delayed bark beetle infestation (Wallin et al. 2003). In addition, large standing dead trees (“snags”) and downed logs supply critical habitat for wildlife and may be destroyed by fuel treatments (Hunter et al. 2007).</p> <p>Where such treatments create coarse woody debris by killing live trees, gains generally do not offset losses, as existing coarse wood is irretrievably destroyed (Randall-Parker and Miller 2002). Recruitment of large live trees will become more limiting over time as climate change imposes chronic drought resulting in reduced tree growth rates and more widespread tree mortality (Diggins et al. 2010, Savage et al.1996, Seager et al. 2007, van Mantgem et al. 2009, Williams et al. 2010). A large tree retention alternative based on the collaborative Strategy discussed above will maintain trees that are most likely to survive fire injury, improving fire resilience, and will supply recruitment potential for old growth habitat in the future.</p> <p>Finally, large tree removal reduces forest canopy and diminishes recruitment of large snags and downed logs, which in turn affects long-term forest dynamics, stand development and wildlife habitat suitability (Quigley et al. 1996, Spies 2004, van Mantgem et al. 2009). If the proposed action includes significant reduction of crown bulk density then it is highly unlikely that the project will maintain habitat for threatened and sensitive wildlife species associated with closed-canopy forest (Beier and Maschinski 2003, Keyes and O’Hara 2002, USDI 1995). A large tree retention alternative will maintain wildlife habitat in the short-term and mitigate adverse effects of vegetation treatments.</p>	
10	<p>Old growth</p> <p>Old growth forest differs in structure, composition and function from younger forests (Kaufmann et al. 1992). Old growth is the preferred habitat of many sensitive wildlife species and it supports a host of ecological services including</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>watershed function, clean water, soil retention and storage of greenhouse gasses (e.g., Luyssaert et al. 2008). Old growth dry conifer forest habitat consists of large trees with fire-resistant “plated” bark structure and tall canopies, snags with nesting cavities and broken tops valuable to wildlife, and structural diversity within stands.</p> <p>The 1996 Plan Amendment (USDA 1996) to the Forest Plans of the Coconino and Tonto national forests, respectively, includes standards and guidelines for old growth management. Each of those national forests must allocate 20 percent of each forested “ecosystem management area” to old growth habitat. To determine what habitat comprises old growth, the Forest Service established numeric criteria applicable to various forest types with different site capabilities and disturbance regimes that include the size, age and number of live trees and snags, as well as downed trees and canopy cover. In addition, the forest plans of the Coconino and Tonto national forests, respectively, require the Forest Service to analyze old growth habitat at multiple scales: (1) the ecosystem management area; (2) one scale above the ecosystem management area; and (3) one scale below the ecosystem management area. The Forest Service must analyze and disclose how many acres within each ecosystem management area currently meet the minimum numeric criteria for old growth habitat; assess potential impacts of proposed actions to old growth at the required scales; allocate no less than 20 percent of each management area to old growth; and <u>must not log</u> any old growth where the mandatory requirements are not met.</p> <p>The revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (USDA 2015a) does not contain any of the standards and guidelines for old growth habitat discussed above. In effect, it rolled back management requirements that previously applied to those forests under the regional plan amendment (USDA 1996). As a result, old growth lacks substantive protection in the revised Forest Plan. The EIS supporting the new Forest Plan (USDA 2015b) did not consider or disclose environmental effects of changing the management approach to old growth. In contrast, the EIS supporting the regional plan amendment (USDA 1996) discussed reasons why it is important to constrain management discretion in order to conserve old growth habitat.</p>	
11	<p>Pinyon-juniper woodlands</p> <p>Differently from the first 4FRI EIS significant acreages of pinyon-juniper woodlands (P-J) are being considered for mechanical treatment. Several</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>scientific sources show that there are several kinds of P-J woodlands with different disturbance regimes and dramatically different natural conditions and ecological dynamics. Cutting in these woodlands should be considered in at least 2 different contexts. First, woodlands in a clearly defined wildland urban interface (WUI) should be considered with community protection as the primary objective. Outside the WUI it is important to determine the type of PJ being addressed and treatments should be tailored to deal with variation in type and disturbance regime. Not all P-J is invasive and not all should be removed under the guise of grassland "restoration".</p>	
12	<p>Mexican spotted owl</p> <p>On April 17, 2009, the Forest Service sought to reinitiate consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (“FWS”) about effects to threatened and endangered species resulting from continued implementation of forest plans in the Southwestern Region. Its letter stated, “It has now become apparent that the Forest Service will likely soon exceed the amount of take issued for at least one species, the Mexican spotted owl.” Moreover, “[I]t has become apparent that the Forest Service is unable to fully implement and comply with the monitoring requirements associated with the Reasonable and Prudent Measures for several species (including MSO) in the [biological opinion].” On June 22, 2010, the FWS formally reinitiated consultation with the Forest Service regarding effects to listed species from continued implementation of forest plans in the Southwestern Region.</p> <p>Pursuant to that reinitiated consultation on forest plan implementation, in 2012, the FWS produced 11 biological opinions and incidental take statements for Mexican spotted owl (“MSO”), each of which is specific to one national forest in the Southwestern Region, including the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino and Tonto national forests, respectively. The 2012 biological opinions and incidental take statements omitted mandatory terms and conditions which the Forest Service admitted on April 17, 2009 that it had violated. In particular, the 2012 opinions and statements of the FWS omitted the prior requirement to monitor MSO habitat and populations, and replaced it with a more modest expectation of reporting incidental take (<i>i.e.</i>, harm or harassment measured by the extent and timing of management disturbance to protected activity centers (“PAC”)). More, the 2012 opinions of the FWS broke precedent and fragmented consultation on MSO to cover each national forest within the range of the Southwestern Region, with separate incidental take statements, rather than issuing one opinion that</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>quantified allowable incidental take of MSO throughout the region. The Center subsequently determined from conversations with Southwestern Region biologists that they stopped tracking incidental take of MSO pursuant to the newer biological opinions, and deferred to the FWS tracking of incidental take. None of the 2012 forest-specific biological opinions account for range-wide impacts to MSO and critical habitat, and none required monitoring of population or habitat trends, which remain unknown.</p> <p>The 2012 biological opinions and incidental take statements of the FWS discussed above continue to govern management of MSO habitat in the Coconino and Tonto national forests, respectively, under the Endangered Species Act (“ESA”). In our view, compliance with terms and conditions of the 2012 opinions and statements will <u>not</u> avoid jeopardy to MSO or adverse modification of critical habitat. The conservation status of MSO and the effect of forest management throughout its range, including this project, are not known to the Forest Service or the FWS. Moreover, the FWS admits uncertainty about vegetation treatments in PAC supporting conservation and recovery MSO (USDI 1995, USDI 2012).</p> <p>On May 13, 2015, the FWS issued another biological opinion that ostensibly shields Forest Service personnel from liability for incidental take of MSO resulting from implementation of the revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests. In that opinion, the FWS stated that out of 150 known PAC on the forests, the occupancy status of 76 PAC (52 percent) were unknown following the 2011 Wallow fire event. “Nonetheless, until we receive site specific occupancy information, we will assume that all of the 150 currently designated PACs are occupied and may continue to be occupied over the life of this project” (USDI 2015: 44). The FWS authorized incidental take of up to 14 individual PAC based on a questionable assumption that all PAC remained occupied after the Wallow fire. That assumption is a Type-II error that favors implementation of the Forest Plan at the expense of MSO conservation and recovery. Jones and others (2016) reported that California spotted owl extirpation was seven times more frequent after high severity fire compared to what occurred in adjacent habitat that did not burn in 2014. The research findings of Jones and others (2016) on spotted owl extirpation after severe fire warrants consideration by the FWS to determine if its occupancy assumption was correct. If the assumption is predicated on an error then the authorization of incidental take of MSO is arbitrary and capricious. Moreover, the FWS did not</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>include in its May 13, 2015 opinion any notice that requires additional consultation in the event that new information may change its analysis. Failure to issue a reinitiation notice in the biological opinion was contrary to regulation, it was arbitrary and capricious, and it violated the ESA.</p> <p>The Forest Service has an independent obligation under the National Forest Management Act (“NFMA”) to monitor changes in MSO populations and habitat because the forest plans of the Coconino and Tonto national forests, respectively, require it. It admitted in an October 2008 Annual Report to the FWS, again in its April 17, 2009 letter discussed above, and in subsequent litigation that it failed to accomplish required monitoring of MSO habitat and populations to ensure that its actions would not jeopardize the continued existence of the species or adversely modify its critical habitat.</p>	
13	<p>The Center expects that the Forest Service will claim in the EIS that a need exists to amend the Coconino and Tonto forest plans, respectively, to suspend the requirements to monitor MSO habitat and populations. We expect that the Forest Service will punt discussion of MSO monitoring to a FWS biological opinion on the project. In the prior round of 4FRI planning, the Center deferred to the Forest Service and the FWS, and voluntarily withdrew its objection claim related to MSO monitoring. However, progress on MSO monitoring to date has not justified our good faith.</p> <p>Any new claim that a need exists to amend forest plans to eliminate the MSO habitat and population monitoring requirements presents a significant issue for analysis in the EIS. In our view, it amounts to a back-door attempt to revise forest plans without requisite disclosure of potentially significant effects to threatened species and critical habitat. Notably, the revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (USDA 2015a) does not include any standard or guideline on monitoring of MSO habitat or populations, and the supporting EIS (USDA 2015b) does not discuss any environmental effect that may result from management of MSO habitat without the benefit of monitoring information that was previously required by the regional plan amendment (USDA 1996). The agencies are flying blind on MSO conservation and recovery, and it is no longer acceptable to kick the can down the road while implementing vegetation treatments in PAC.</p> <p>A complete monitoring plan for MSO, including study design and analysis protocols, should be made available for public review and comment before a</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>decision is made to implement the project. The Center has specific questions regarding a monitoring plan for the project, including but not limited to: (1) criteria for selection of PAC as paired treatment and control sites; (2) criteria for selection of measurable indicators of change; (3) sampling design power analysis and expected observational error rates; (4) sampling procedures including monitoring cycle; (5) confidence levels to be applied in data analysis and reporting; (6) incorporation of monitoring information from concurrent projects affecting MSO and critical habitat; (7) timeframe for evaluation of results; and (8) triggers for management adaptation using new information.</p>	
14	<p>Prather and others (2008) discussed means to accomplish the purpose and need without adversely affecting MSO. “[E]ven without application of treatments that would seriously affect MSO habitat, managers could achieve approximately 60% of the fuels reduction that would be achieved if there were no restrictions on treatments. With reasonable tradeoffs considered in planning, such as largely treating in lower suitability owl habitat, this figure would rise to over 80%” (Prather et al. 2008: 148). “When conservation and restoration planning is scaled-up from a stand to landscape scale, many apparent conflicts disappear as management actions are spatially partitioned and prioritized” (Prather et al. 2008: 149). The Forest Service should develop alternatives for vegetation treatment that implement existing forest plan standards and guidelines for MSO habitat on the Coconino and Tonto national forests, respectively, without amendment. Such an alternative would provide meaningful basis for comparative analysis of environmental effects to inform the project decision on an obviously significant issue.</p> <p>The revised Apache-Sitgreaves Forest Plan repealed standards and guidelines affecting management of MSO habitat. It replaced prior standards and guidelines (USDA 1996) with vaguely worded “desired conditions” and “objectives” that are designed to maximize agency discretion and evade accountability in project-level management activities. The Forest Service intends that desired conditions will drive site-specific project design and decision-making, even if those plan components have no force or effect. The only relevant <u>guideline</u> in the revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests states, “Activities occurring within federally listed species habitat <u>should</u> apply habitat management objectives and species protection measures from recovery plans” (USDA 1995a: 62) [emphasis added]. That guideline will not avoid jeopardy to MSO or adverse modification of critical</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>habitat, and the Forest Service claim that the revised Forest Plan will ensure MSO viability is arbitrary and capricious because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="499 342 1409 574">(1) It ignores criteria prescribed by the NFMA for viability determinations, including “changes in vegetation type, timber age classes, community composition, rotation age, and year-long suitability of habitat related to mobility of management indicator species.” 36 C.F.R. § 219.19(a)(1) (1982). MSO is a management indicator species under the revised Forest Plan. The Forest Service admits uncertainty regarding MSO habitat and population trends on the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests. <li data-bbox="499 610 1394 842">(2) It relies on discretionary plan components (<i>i.e.</i>, desired conditions, objectives and guidelines) as the sole basis for viability findings, and asserts that projects “would incorporate” applicable recovery plans for federally listed species including MSO. The only relevant proposed guideline would <u>not</u> constrain project-level decisions because guidelines “may be modified for a specific project,” and “the forest supervisor may amend the plan at any time.” <li data-bbox="499 878 1419 1377">(3) The MSO Recovery Plan (USDI 2012) is not enforceable in project-level management decisions, and the Forest Service is well aware of this fact. Merely referencing it in a plan guideline fails to ensure viability. <i>See</i> USDI (1996a: 39) (concluding jeopardy to MSO and adverse modification of critical habitat where forest management plans “lack the management direction to prevent the development of forest project-level activities that are likely to adversely affect the Mexican spotted owl,” and, “The definition of standards and guidelines [in the 1996 forest plan amendment] states that standards and guidelines are, ‘the bounds or constraints within which all management activities are to be carried out in achieving forest plan objectives’”); <i>also see</i> USDI (1996b: 29) (concluding no jeopardy to MSO and no adverse modification of critical habitat because the Forest Service formally adopted recommendations of the MSO Recovery Plan as “standards and guidelines” in forest management plans with a Record of Decision). <li data-bbox="499 1412 1402 1510">(4) The efficacy of management direction, as described in desired conditions and objectives for ponderosa pine and mixed conifer vegetation types, in promoting MSO viability and recovery is uncertain (USDI 2012). The 	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Forest Service is required by NEPA to disclose controversy and uncertainty regarding effects to MSO and its critical habitat, but it has not done so in the EIS supporting the revised Forest Plan.</p> <p>The revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests (USDA 2015a) repealed many standards and guidelines MSO habitat that previously governed project-level actions (USDA 1996). The repealed standards and guidelines: (1) required survey of suitable MSO habitat prior to project implementation and designation of PAC where owls are found; (2) prohibited vegetation treatments in MSO nest cores and allowed limited treatments in PAC; (3) required selection of an equal number of PAC as untreated control areas when treatments occur; (4) prohibited harvest of trees larger than 9-inches diameter in PAC; (5) maintained a portion of “target/threshold” habitat suitable for MSO nesting and roosting behaviors; (6) retained at least 150-170 ft²/acre basal area and 20 trees/acre larger than 18-inches diameter at breast height (“DBH”) in target/threshold habitat; (7) retained trees larger than 24-inches DBH in suitable nesting and roosting habitat (<i>i.e.</i>, “restricted areas”); and (8) required monitoring of MSO habitat and population trends. <i>See</i> USDA (1996: 87-91). No such requirements occur in the revised Forest Plan. The supporting EIS supplied no explanation for the sea change in management approach, and it did not disclose any potentially significant environmental effects that may result from repeal of the standards and guidelines for MSO habitat.</p> <p>At minimum, the Forest Service should apply recommendations of the MSO Recovery Plan (USDI 2012) to all action alternatives. The Center objected to the Flagstaff Watershed Protection Project in the Coconino National Forest, in part, because that draft decision included extensive road construction in PAC, contrary to scientific recommendations of the Recovery Plan. We ultimately deferred to the Forest Service and voluntarily withdrew that objection when the agency deferred construction of one road segment in PAC. However, given the scale of the proposed action, the Center’s previously stated concerns about road construction in PAC are revived. Please take note of the comment above describing recommendations of Prather and others (2008). The Forest Service should avoid road construction in PAC.</p>	
15	<p>Northern goshawk</p> <p>Most of the proposed action will occur in ponderosa pine forest habitat of sensitive northern goshawk. The Forest Service advanced standards and</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>guidelines for management goshawk habitat that accounted for the viability of 14 vertebrate prey species associated with ponderosa pine forest (USDA 1996; Reynolds et al. 1992). However, the revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests repealed nearly all of those standards and guidelines without disclosing potentially significant effects to viability of goshawk or its prey. More, the proposed action may include amendment of the Coconino and Tonto forest plans, respectively, which we assume will reflect similar plan amendments in concurrent actions on the affected national forests. Plan amendments of that flavor present a significant issue for analysis because: (1) the Forest Service has never reasoned why repealing standards and guidelines for goshawk habitat is warranted; (2) the agency has never explained why newer grey literature (Reynolds et al. 2013) should override its own NEPA analysis; and (3) it has not stated how the viability of sensitive wildlife dependent on closed-canopy forest habitat will be assured if new management direction calls for creation of so-called “interspace” in addition to the grass/forb/shrub openings described as “VSS 1.”</p> <p>The Center raised specific concern about goshawk prey viability in its administrative appeal of the revised Forest Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests. Those concerns also apply to similar amendments of the Coconino or Tonto forest plans, as stated in comments and objections on concurrent projects (<i>e.g.</i>, 4FRI Round One, Clints Well, Cragin, Larson, Mahan-Landmark, Marshall, Turkey Butte, Rim Lakes, Upper Beaver, Wing Mountain). Prior NEPA analysis established a habitat-proxy relation of ponderosa pine forest structure to goshawk viability, and a proxy-on-proxy relation of goshawk habitat to viability of the 14 prey species.</p>	
16	<p>Aquatic species</p> <p>One significant difference between the Rim Country EIS planning area and the first 4FRI EIS planning area is the presence of significant aquatic species and habitats. Extreme care should be taken concerning these species and their habitats given their rarity and the potential impacts from mechanical logging techniques. Given the scope of this project is worth considering impacts to aquatic species and habitats in a regional context similar to the effects of listed species such as the Mexican Spotted Owl. A regional aquatic protection strategy including regional standards and guidelines should be considered.</p>	
17	<p>Cumulative effects</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Significant cumulative effects may result from the proposed action in combination with past, ongoing and foreseeable management activities. The Forest Service should give a hard look to such impacts and disclose them rather than merely list potential causes or mention that some risk may result from a catalogue of activities.</p> <p>Active livestock grazing allotments are ubiquitous in the project area. Grazing concurrent with the proposed action may adversely impact forest resilience and undermine the purpose and need. It directly contributes to fire hazard by altering vegetation communities, delaying fire rotations, increasing forest density, and reducing forage opportunities for herbivorous species and predators (Arnold 1950, Belsky and Blumenthal 1997, Cooper 1960, Madany and West 1983, Mitchell and Freeman 1993, Rummell 1951). Potentially significant cumulative effects to soil productivity, plant communities, fire regime and wildlife may result from vegetation treatments in combination with livestock grazing. Livestock also facilitate the spread of exotic species, particularly in combination with fire, and reduce the competitive and reproductive capacities of native species. Exotic plant species, once established, can displace native species, in part, because native grasses are not adapted to frequent and close grazing in combination with fire disturbance (Mack and Thompson 1982, Melgoza et al. 1990, Belsky and Gelbard 2000). Exotic plant spread is a potentially significant cumulative impact of the proposed action. Treatments similar to the proposed action left forest sites overrun with cheatgrass (<i>Bromus tectorum</i>) (McGlone et al. 2009). Exotic grass invasion is foreseeable and has important long-term implications for native plant communities in fire-adapted ecosystems and wildlife.</p> <p>Thank you for taking note of this comment. Please timely notify me of all developments with the project. I wish to be involved at every opportunity.</p>	
Letter 42		Jason Gerdes EPA
1	<p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the Forest Service’s Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Forest Restoration Initiative Rim Country Project. Our review and comments are provided pursuant to NEPA, Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The EPA strongly supports the objectives of the Four Forest Restoration Initiative. We praised the Forest Service for its dedication to public outreach and collaboration</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>during the earlier 4FRI NEPA process, and the efforts made to incorporate the best available science into the Draft EIS. In particular, I appreciate that the 4FRI team took me on a site visit of the planning area during the scoping process, and worked with me and EPA Region Viii's Richard Graham to include information in the DEIS on the potential for smoke from prescribed fire treatments to contain radioactive substances.</p> <p>We subsequently reviewed the 4FRI DEIS and provided comments to the Forest Service on May 16, 2013. We recommend that the Forest Service consider a number of issues when preparing the 4FRI Rim Country EIS, including: the range of alternatives to be evaluated; the regulatory framework surrounding the proposed action; air quality; environmental justice; and climate change. These issues are discussed further in the attached Detailed Comments. We appreciate the opportunity to review this scoping notice and are available to discuss our comments. When the EIS prepared for this proposed action is released for public review, please send one hard copy and one CD to the address above (mail code: ENF-4-2). If you have questions, please contact me at (415) 947-4221 or gerdes.jason@epa.gov.</p>	
2	<p>Statement of Purpose and Need The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for this proposed action should clearly identify the underlying purpose and need to which the Forest Service is responding in proposing the alternatives (40 CFR 1502.13). The purpose of the proposed action is typically the specific objectives of the activity, while the need for the proposed action may be to eliminate a broader underlying problem or take advantage of an opportunity. Recommendation: The purpose and need should be a clear, objective statement of the rationale for the proposed project.</p>	
3	<p>Alternatives Analysis All reasonable alternatives that fulfill the proposed action's purpose and need should be evaluated in detail, including alternatives outside the legal jurisdiction of the Forest Service (40 CFR Section 1502.14(c)). The EIS should provide a clear discussion of the reasons for the elimination of alternatives which are not evaluated in detail. A robust range of alternatives will include options for avoiding significant environmental impacts. The EIS should clearly describe the rationale used to determine whether impacts of an alternative are significant or not. Thresholds of significance should be determined by considering the context and intensity of an action and its effects (40 CFR 1508.27). The environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives should be presented in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decision maker and the</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	public (40 CFR 1502.14). The potential environmental impacts of each alternative should be quantified to the greatest extent possible (e.g. acres of wetlands impacted; change in water quality).	
4	Regulatory Framework The EIS prepared for the proposed action should include a comprehensive description of the regulatory context of the project. This section should include a description of any permits and/or modifications to those permits that the proposed action will require (e.g. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits for discharges to Waters of the United States).	
5	<p>Biological Resources, Habitat and Wildlife The EIS should identify all petitioned and listed threatened and endangered species and critical habitat that might occur within the project area. The document should identify and quantify which species or critical habitat might be directly, indirectly, or cumulatively affected by each alternative and mitigate impacts to these species; emphasis should be placed on the protection and recovery of species due to their status or potential status under the federal or state Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>Recommendations: Identify all petitioned and listed threatened and endangered species and critical habitat that might occur within the project area. Identify and quantify which species or critical habitat might be directly, indirectly, or cumulatively affected by each alternative. Discuss how the proposed action would comply with ESA requirements, including any Section 7 consultation efforts with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Any relevant documents associated with the ESA Section 7 consultation process, including Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions, should be summarized and included in an appendix in the EIS.</p> <p>Air Quality</p> <p>The EIS should provide a detailed discussion of ambient air conditions (baseline or existing conditions), National Ambient Air Quality Standards, criteria pollutant nonattainment areas, and potential air quality impacts of the proposed action (including cumulative and indirect impacts). Such an evaluation is necessary to assure compliance with State and Federal air quality regulations, and to disclose the potential impacts from temporary or cumulative degradation of air quality. The EIS should describe and estimate air emissions from potential construction, operation and maintenance activities, as well as proposed mitigation measures to minimize those emissions. The EPA recommends an</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>evaluation of the following measures to reduce emissions of criteria air pollutants and hazardous air pollutants (air toxics). Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Conditions — The EIS should provide a detailed discussion of ambient air conditions, National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and criteria pollutant nonattainment areas in the vicinity of the project. • Quantj5’ Emissions — The document should estimate emissions of criteria pollutants from the proposed project and discuss the timeframe for release of these emissions over the lifespan of the project. The document should describe and estimate emissions from potential construction activities, as well as proposed mitigation measures to minimize these emissions. • Spec/’ Emission Sources — The document should specify the emission sources by pollutant from mobile sources, stationary sources, and ground disturbance. This source specific information should be used to identify appropriate mitigation measures and areas in need of the greatest attention. • Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan — Include, in the EIS, a list of all mitigation measures to be implemented as part of a construction emissions mitigation plan. In addition to measures necessary to meet all applicable local, state, and federal requirements, we recommend that the following measures be included: Fugitive Dust Source Controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stabilize open storage piles and disturbed areas by covering and/or applying water or chemical/organic dust palliative where appropriate. This applies to both inactive and active sites, during workdays, weekends, holidays, and windy conditions. • hstall wind fencing and phase grading operations where appropriate, and operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions. • When hauling material and operating non-earthmoving equipment, prevent spillage and limit speeds to 15 miles per hour. Limit speed of earth-moving equipment to 10 mph. Mobile and Stationary Source Controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize use, trips, and unnecessary idling of heavy equipment. • Maintain and tune engines per manufacturer’s specifications to perform at EPA certification levels, where applicable, and to perform at verified standards applicable to retrofit technologies. • Limit unnecessary idling and ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained, tuned, and modified consistent with established specifications. The California Air Resources Board has a number of mobile source anti-idling requirements which should be employed (http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck idling/truck-idling.htm). • Prohibit any tampering with engines and require continuing adherence to manufacturer’s recommendations. Administrative controls: • Specify the means 	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>by which impacts to sensitive receptors, such as children, the elderly, and the infirm, would be avoided. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare an inventory of all equipment prior to construction. • Develop a construction traffic and parking management plan that minimizes traffic interference and maintains traffic flow. • Identify where implementation of mitigation measures is rejected based on economic infeasibility. 	
6	<p>Climate Change</p> <p>On August 5, 2016, the Council on Environmental Quality issued final guidance on considering greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change in NEPA reviews. Fundamental to this guidance are the recommendations that when addressing climate change, agencies should consider:</p> <p>(1) The potential effects of a proposed action on climate change as indicated by assessing GHG emissions (e.g., to include, where applicable, carbon sequestration); and, (2) The effects of climate change on a proposed action and its environmental impacts. The CEQ final guidance also includes a section regarding biogenic GHG emissions from land management actions, including actions, such as prescribed burning and fuel load reductions, proposed in the 4FRI Rim Country Project. The guidance states that in addressing biogenic GHG emissions, resource management agencies should include a comparison of estimated net GHG emissions and carbon stock changes that are projected to occur with and without implementation of proposed land or resource management actions; additionally, this analysis should take into account the GHG emissions, carbon sequestration potential, and the changes in carbon stocks that are relevant to decision making in light of the proposed actions and timeframes under consideration.'</p> <p>Recommendations: The EIS should include an estimate of the GHG emissions associated with the proposed action, qualitatively describe relevant climate change impacts, and analyze reasonable alternatives and/or practicable mitigation measures to reduce project-related GHG emissions. The NEPA analysis should address the appropriateness of considering changes to the design of the proposal to incorporate GHG reduction measures and resilience to foreseeable climate change. The EIS should make clear whether commitments have been made to</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>ensure implementation of design or other measures to reduce GHG emissions or to adapt to climate change impacts. The EIS should include a comparison of net GHG emissions and carbon stock changes that are anticipated to occur, with and without implementation of the proposed vegetation management actions.</p>	
7	<p>Coordination with Tribal Governments Executive Order 13175, “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments” (November 6, 2000), was issued in order to establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials in the development of federal policies that have tribal implications, and to strengthen the United States government-to-government relationships with Indian tribes.</p> <p>Recommendation: The EIS should describe the process and outcome of government-to-government consultation between the Forest Service and each of the tribal governments within the project area, issues that were raised (if any), and how those issues were addressed in the selection of the proposed alternative. National Historic Preservation Act and Executive Order 13007 Consultation for tribal cultural resources is required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Historic properties under the NHPA are properties that are included in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or that meet the criteria for the National Register. Section 106 of the NHPA requires a federal agency, upon determining that activities under its control could affect historic properties, consult with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer/Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO/THPO).</p> <p>Under NEPA, any impacts to tribal, cultural, or other treaty resources must be discussed and mitigated. Section 106 of the NHPA requires that Federal agencies consider the effects of their actions on cultural resources, following regulation in 36 CFR 800. Executive Order 13007, “Indian Sacred Sites” (May 24, 1996), requires federal land managing agencies to accommodate access to, and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian Religious practitioners, and to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity, accessibility, or use of sacred sites. It is important to note that a sacred site may not meet the National Register criteria for a historic property and that, conversely, a historic property may not meet the criteria for a sacred site. Recommendation: The EIS should address the existence of Indian sacred sites in the project areas. It should address Executive Order 13007, distinguish it from Section 106 of the NHPA, and discuss how the Service will avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity, accessibility, or use</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	of sacred sites, if they exist. The EIS should provide a summary of all coordination with Tribes and with the SHPO/THPO, including identification of NRHP eligible sites, and development of a Cultural Resource Management Plan.	
8	<p>Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” (February 11, 1994), and the “Memorandum of Understanding on Environmental Justice and Executive Order 12898,” released on August 4, 2011, direct federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations, allowing those populations a meaningful opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. Guidance 2 by CEQ clarifies the terms low-income and minority population (which includes American Indians) and describes the factors to consider when evaluating disproportionately high and adverse human health effects.</p> <p>Recommendation: The EIS should include an evaluation of environmental justice populations within the geographic scope of the project. If such populations exist, the EIS should address the potential for disproportionate adverse impacts to minority and low-income populations, and the approaches used to foster public participation by these populations. Assessment of the project’s impact on minority and low-income populations should reflect coordination with those affected populations.</p>	
9	<p>Coordination with Land Use Planning Activities The EIS should discuss how the proposed action would support or conflict with the objectives of federal, state, tribal or local land use plans, policies and controls in the project area. The term “land use plans” includes all types of formally adopted documents for land use planning, conservation, zoning and related regulatory requirements. Proposed plans not yet developed should also be addressed if they have been formally proposed by the appropriate government body in a written form (CEQ’s Forty Questions, #23b).</p>	
10	<p>Invasive Species Executive Order 13112, “Invasive Species” (February 3, 1999), mandates that federal agencies take actions to prevent the introduction of invasive species, provide for their control, and minimize the economic, ecological, and human health impacts that invasive species cause. Executive Order 13112 also calls for the restoration of native plants and tree species. If the proposed project will entail new landscaping, the EIS should describe how the project will meet the requirements of Executive Order 13112. Recommendation.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	The EIS should include an invasive plant management plan to monitor and control noxious weeds.	
Letter 43		Steve Spangle, USFWS
1	<p>Thank you for your June 21, 2016 request for comments concerning the proposed action for the 4FRI Rim Country Project, Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, and Tonto National Forests, in Apache, Coconino, Gila, Navajo, and Yavapai Counties, Arizona. The Forest Service is proposing to conduct various restoration activities within a 1,240,000-acre ponderosa pine and mixed conifer forest ecosystem (project area) over approximately 10 years. Treatment areas are located on the Black Mesa and Lakeside districts of the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest, on the Mogollon Rim and Red Rock districts of the Coconino National Forest, and the Payson and Pleasant Valley districts of the Tonto National Forest.</p> <p>The purpose of the project is to reestablish and restore forest structure and pattern, forest health, and vegetation composition and diversity in ponderosa pine ecosystems to conditions within the natural range of variation, thus moving the project area toward desired conditions. Overall, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) supports the Forest Service's efforts to plan and implement landscape-level forest restoration, and will continue to actively assist your agency in the development of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the project. The comments provided below are intended to assist in providing technical assistance toward the development of the proposed action and DEIS. Our comments are based upon the June 2016 Proposed Action.</p>	
2	<p>General Comments Existing Conditions 1.</p> <p>The proposed action write-up includes very few citations, but there are multiple areas where the proposal would be substantially stronger if supporting literature was provided. For example, Table 2, which provides numbers regarding the existing and desired conditions for forest cover types, does not include any citations or references indicating the source of the desired conditions. We are particularly interested in the sources used to define the desired conditions for dry mixed conifer.</p> <p>It appears that the average basal area and average trees per acre data was obtained from Reynolds et al. (2013). However, there is additional data on mixed conifer that has been collected since that General Technical Report was</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>published that may aid in refining the ranges provided (e.g., Margolis and Malevich (2016) found that tree density in dry conifer forests historically ranged from open [36 trees per acre] to moderately dense [162 trees per acre]). We recommend that the Forest Service cite the basis for the desired conditions stated in the proposed action and update information with the best available science as the DEIS is developed. In addition, the range for the desired average basal area for dry mixed conifer is different in Table 2 from that listed in Table 7.</p>	
3	<p>2. Tables 3 and 4 describe existing crown fire potential in forest cover types. However, there is a column titled "No fire" in both tables that is undefined. We recommend that all terms be clearly defined throughout the document to minimize the potential for confusion.</p>	
4	<p>3. Table 7 describes the desired conditions by cover type. We noticed in our review that the ranges listed for the average basal area for Ponderosa Pine/Gambel Oak and Dry Mixed Conifer do not include the full range for these cover types. Ponderosa Pine/Gambel Oak should have an upper limit of 110, and dry mixed conifer should have an upper limit of 120 for basal area. We also recommend providing data/information regarding why the average trees per acre for dry mixed conifer (20-100 trees per acre [TP A]) is less than the ponderosa pine (11-124 TPA) cover types.</p>	
5	<p>4. The proposed action (page 11) states "For the dry mixed conifer type, forest plan direction is to allow fire to play its natural role, with high frequency (averaging about 12 years) ... " We recommend including more specificity about what is known regarding dry mixed conifer fire return intervals and not using averages to describe the desired condition. If the goal is to allow fire to play its natural role, then the fuU range of fire return intervals for dry mixed conifer should be included in the proposed action. Swetnam and Baisan (1996) contains a summary of tree-ring studies conducted at 24 mixed conifer sites in Arizona and New Mexico, and reported historical mean fire intervals that ranged from about 4 to 15 years for mixed-conifer sites dominated by ponderosa pine. On sites with a more even mix of mixed-conifer tree species, but still containing ponderosa pine, Swetnam and Baisan (1996) found fire-return intervals ranged from about 8 to 26 years. Longer mean fire-return intervals (19-30 years) were reported by Grissino-Mayer <i>et al.</i> (2004) for three mixed-conifer sites containing ponderosa pine in southern Colorado. Other researchers have documented historical fire return intervals at sites in New Mexico, northern Arizona, and southern Colorado within this range (4-30 years) (Brown et al. 2001, Heinlein <i>et al.</i> 2005, Fule <i>et al.</i> 2003, Fule <i>et al.</i> 2009, Margolis and Balmat 2009, Bigio <i>et al.</i> 2010). The range of fire intervals in dry mixed conifer characterizes the</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>diversity of this forest type and likely reflects interactions between climate, fuels, and topography. Longer fire-return intervals can result from a heterogeneous landscape structure that restricts fire spread (Iniguez <i>et al.</i> 2009) or long periods between climate conditions favorable for fire (Margolis and Swetnam 2013).</p> <p>We recommend that the Forest Service include this information in the "toolbox of treatments" to ensure the range of fire return intervals in dry mixed conifer is allowed for across the project area.</p>	
6	<p>5. The proposed action (page 11) briefly describes desired conditions for Mexican spotted owls. We recommend modifying the "higher tree densities" to specifically state that we are attempting to increase the density of larger trees on the landscape in owl habitat, not manage for unsustainable levels of "high tree density." We refer you to Table C.2 (pages 275-277) in the Revised Recovery Plan for the Mexican spotted owl (USDI FWS 2012) for more detail regarding desired conditions, particularly in protected activity centers and nest/roost replacement recovery habitat.</p>	
7	<p>6. The discussion regarding stream and aquatic habitat does not provide many details regarding the desired conditions or how the Forest Service intends to improve conditions in these areas. We recommend that language regarding these critically important habitats be very specific. In the "East Clear Creek Watershed Recovery Strategy for the Little Colorado Spinedace and Other Riparian Species" (Multiple Agencies, 1999), we defined criteria for rating individual stream (drainage) reaches and prioritizing treatment for these areas. We recommend that the Forest Service, Arizona Game and Fish Department, and other interested stakeholders work with us to use the data and evaluations developed for the eastern Coconino-western Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests to define actions that still need to be completed, identify new activities, and build criteria for assessing areas outside of the Clear Creek watershed for habitat improvement actions.</p>	
8	<p>7. The discussion regarding forest cover types and how these cover types are broken out in Table 10 is not consistent with existing and revised forest plans or the Revised Recovery Plan for the Mexican spotted owl (USDI FWS 2012). Within the project area, there are two types of owl habitat - mixed conifer and ponderosa pine/Gambel oak (see "Key to Forest Types Referenced in the Recovery Plan" pages 254-256). It is confusing to have new categories of mixed conifer and ponderosa pine/oak listed as northern goshawk habitat, but not owl habitat. There is also some confusion regarding definitions. Ponderosa pine with</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>less than 10% of the stand basal area in Gambel oak greater than five inches diameter-at-root collar is not considered "pine-oak." There is likely still oak in many pine stands that could be enhanced through active management, but that does not make it a "ponderosa pine/Gambel oak" cover type. The same is true for mixed conifer in terms of how it has been described in the proposed action. We would like to meet with you to further discuss the classification system used in the proposed action and the benefit to continuing to use the definitions for these cover types described in the Recovery Plan to ensure consistency between this and other forest plans and projects.</p>	
9	<p>8. The scope and size of the Rim County Analysis Area is very large. To effectively implement forest restoration and other activities to improve wildlife habitat at this scale, there is a need to have a robust monitoring framework. Therefore, we recommend the Forest Service work with us to develop specific desired conditions for each restoration element affecting listed species, clearly articulate triggers for management change, and ensure the adaptive management strategy identifies a process for modifying management actions when objectives are not met.</p> <p>We appreciate this opportunity to provide comments on the Rim Country Project, and we look forward to continuing our work with your agency in development of the DEIS.</p>	
		Jean Public
1	<p>I oppose logging the trees. trees should be left alone and respected for nature. each tree makes oxygen for 4 people to breathe. there is nothing more essential. the attack and marauding by the fs on our national land are indicative of moneygrubbing, not necessary attention at all. I very much oppose prescribed burning of the trees and the air pollution that is engendered will flow east and cause death and injury to people from breathing fine particulate matter.</p>	
2	<p>I agree with decommissioning roads. why is natural hydrology being changed with streams. also "restore streams" seems impossible. I oppose protective barriers. I think nature has an important role to play here</p>	
3	<p>I find that this agency is all about attacking nature with stupid man made attempts to gain money. so much of our federal govt agency work is about money coming into the agency. it never comes to the general treasury. it comes to the agency. the logging brings huge sums to this agency. that is why they want to do it. its crass. its unnatural. its damaging to everybody's environment. this comment is for the public record.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
Letter 44		John Hamill, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership
1	<p>1. Project Objective, Purpose and Need:</p> <p>TRCP supports the objective of the Rim Country Proposed Action “to reestablish and restore forest structure and pattern, forest health, and vegetation composition and diversity in ponderosa pine ecosystems to conditions within the natural range of variation, thus moving the project area toward the desired conditions.” We further support the Purposes and Needs stated for the Proposed Action to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase forest resiliency and sustainability; • Reduce risk of undesirable fire effects; • Improve terrestrial and aquatic species habitat; • Improve the condition and function of streams and springs; • Restore woody riparian vegetation; • Preserve cultural resources; • Support sustainable forest products industries. 	
2	<p>2. Increase and broaden the wildlife focus</p> <p>The Proposed Action should include and emphasize a broader scope of wildlife habitat restoration needs and actions in addition to those benefitting federally protected species. Many Arizona sportsmen utilize and depend on the project area for a quality hunting and fishing experience. A recent state-wide survey conducted by TRCP and the Arizona Game and Fish Department indicates that the project area includes some of the State’s most highly valued hunting and fishing areas for elk, deer, turkey, trout, and pronghorn antelope (see: www.azgfd.com/Recreation/ValueMapping). Hunting and fishing for these species are economically and socially important to local and neighboring communities. As such, we recommend that the Purpose and Need be expanded to include “Support quality hunting and fishing and other compatible recreation opportunities”. The proposed action and treatments should emphasize actions that will improve terrestrial and aquatic habitat conditions, maintain/restore functioning wildlife migration corridors, and provide reasonable access. In addition, the Proposed Action should address increasing wildlife diversity by increasing spatial heterogeneity of habitat components for both aquatic and terrestrial wildlife.</p>	
3	<p>3. Emphasize wildlife waters</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>Many wildlife waters (e.g., water collection aprons, drinkers, etc.) in the project area have been degraded or are no longer functioning due to damage from catastrophic wildfire or lack of maintenance. These waters need to be repaired (i.e., sediment removal) or replaced. For waters that are exclusively wildlife waters, exclusion fencing may need repair or replacement to keep livestock out. There are other areas of wildlife habitat that have been identified for the installation of new waters. These repairs, replacements, and installations will improve habitat for wildlife and improve wildlife distribution across the landscape.</p>	
4	<p>4. Emphasize wildlife connectivity and migration corridors.</p> <p>An objective of the Proposed Action should be to create and restore wildlife corridors through thinning to connect wildlife habitat blocks on the landscape. For example, emphasis should be placed on mechanical treatments that will maintain and/or restore montane meadow connectivity through the removal of trees, including juniper and large young trees where wildlife travel corridors have been identified.</p> <p>Within the Rim Country project area, fence improvements and modifications would benefit wildlife through increasing wildlife connectivity on the landscape. For example, unnecessary fences need to be removed to allow wildlife to move through important movement corridors between habitat blocks. There are also other fences that require repair to keep livestock within allotments and protect sensitive wildlife resources. Wildlife would also benefit from wildlife friendly modifications to other fences that would retain livestock while allowing wildlife to cross.</p>	
5	<p>5. Clarify that decommissioning roads will be done pursuant to approved Travel Management Rules (TMR)</p> <p>Decommissioning of roads should be done in accordance with approved TMR's not the Rim Country EIS. Page 5 (Roads) indicates that "there is a need to decommission unneeded routes identified during the forest Travel Management Rule review processes as part of the restoration of the landscape in the project area." However, page 14 indicates that the Proposed Action will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decommission approximately 230 miles of existing system and unauthorized roads on the Coconino and Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests. 	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decommission approximately 20 miles of unauthorized roads on the Tonto National Forest. • Improve approximately 150 miles of existing non-system roads and construct approximately 350 miles of temporary roads for haul access; decommission when treatments are completed. • Relocate and reconstruct existing open roads adversely affecting water quality and natural resources, or of concern to human safety. <p>It's unclear whether these proposed actions are authorized in approved TMR's. Please clarify that the USFS does not propose to change the transportation network outside of the TMR process.</p>	
6	<p>6. Emphasize and expand the scope of stream restoration actions.</p> <p>The project area includes numerous streams that support some of the most productive trout fisheries in the state and contributes to Arizona's vital water supplies. The project area is also home to the endangered, Gila trout that is important from both a conservation and recreational perspective. The proposed forest restoration combined with thoughtful hydrologic rehabilitation can produce resilient, sustainable and highly functioning watersheds that supports both native and recreational fisheries. All perennial, ephemeral, or intermittent streams (not just those identified in Figure 6, page 19) should be eligible under the EIS to receive restoration and/or improvements, if needed. All drainages have an impact downstream and cumulative effects are greater moving down a watershed. Forest restoration treatments will be watershed wide and landscape scale, and as such, impact every collection of water regardless of size. Not all streams may need restoration or special treatment, but the EIS should provide the necessary compliance if restoration or special treatment is deemed appropriate. Prior to mechanical or fire restoration treatments, the hydrologic impacts of the treatment to streams, aquatic ecosystems, and riparian areas should be formally evaluated. Treatments should be adjusted to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts.</p>	
7	<p>7. Emphasize monitoring as a critical element of adaptive management.</p> <p>Monitoring of fish and wildlife resources both pre- and post-restoration is necessary for determining if restoration activities are effective, and that treatments are managed adaptively to avoid and/or minimize the potential for negative impacts to wildlife and/or the habitats. Aquatic habitat monitoring is particularly critical to ensure treatments are not resulting in long-term negative impacts to watershed health. The Rim Country Proposed Action should be</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Comment Source
	<p>amended to recognize the needs for pre- and post-treatment monitoring and describe how it will be used in the project.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments and for all the efforts of the 4FRI EIS team to work collaboratively with stakeholders to prepare the Rim Country EIS. The TRCP looks forward to continued involvement with the 4FRI effort. Please contact me if you have questions or need additional information.</p>	
E-mails		Several commentors
1	Several commentors requested an extension of the scoping comment period.	
Open House Comments		Open House Comments
1	Very interested in stream recovery and springs etc.	
2	I know it is a very large area, but I wish the steps could be accelerated. The longer it takes the greater the likelihood of controllable wildfires taking over areas that are planned for thinning/restoration.	
3	I am just so happy to see the plans and what's happening. We need to keep your forests healthy and safe! Just hurry up, and get it done!	
4	Time. Your time line is to long!	
5	<p>As a private citizen and regular rim hiker and camper I always see dense thickets of six foot and under ponderosa pines. From what I have seen and heard here these are a problem. Yet if I cut just one of these thicket trees I am subject to a fine and arrest.</p> <p>I really think it would be more logical to encourage regulars to the forest to prune (low dead branches) and cut thick groups under 6 feet.</p>	
6	Very interested in stream recovery (and springs etc.)	
7	I know it is a very large area, but I wish the steps could be accelerated. The longer it takes the greater the likelihood of uncontrollable wildfires taking over areas that are planned for thinning/restoration.	

References for information in the Addressed Column: