

**Forest Service response to comments
on the February 2007 draft proposed land management plan**

Table 1 shows the names and codes for those who commented on the February 2007 draft plan.

Table 2 shows the comments, the commenter codes, page and line numbers for the comments, and the Forest Service responses. The page and line numbers in the table correspond to the page and line numbers in the accompanying February 2007 version of the draft proposed plan.

Table 1—Names and codes for commenters.

Name of commenter	Commenter code
Al Sammons	AS
Biodiversity Conservation Alliance	BD
Bruce Fauskee	BF
Bicyclers	BK
Clark Resource Council	CC
Dick Inberg	DI
Ecosystem Research Group	EG
Fred Ziegler	FZ
Wyoming Game and Fish Department	GF
Hot Springs County	HS
Interdisciplinary team	IDT
Intermountain Forestry	IF
Jeff Sorkin	JS
Meeteetse Conservation District	MC
NOLS	NL
Robert Cain	RC
Ray Hansen	RH
Forest Service regional office	RO
Wyoming Department of Agriculture	SA
Sierra Club	SC
Wyoming State Forestry	SF
Wyoming Outdoor Council	WC
Wyoming Wilderness Association	WW

Where are my comments?

We read all the comments that were submitted to us.

If you don't see your name in the Table 1, it's because your comment was probably covered by another's. The purpose of this informal comment analysis was to respond to the public comments and address them in the draft plan, not to catalog everyone's comments. When the proposed plan is published this summer for the formal 90-day comment period, a comprehensive comment analysis will be completed.

If you feel your comment wasn't addressed, please talk to us about it.

Thank you,

The planning team

Table 2–Comments and Forest Service responses

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
1	15	GF	We are still confused as to the scope of this document. USFS representatives have stated that NEPA analysis is not necessary to develop and implement this land management plan, ostensibly due to the fact the plan does not call for specific on-the-ground actions. This is explicitly stated in the first bullet point on page 1 of the plan. In what appears to be a contradiction, the text in the last paragraph on page 1 states no changes can be made to plan components without the NEPA process. How can the plan be legally adopted without the NEPA process, yet changes to the plan require the NEPA process?	There is a NEPA process for approval of the revised plan. A categorical exclusion is a document type that falls under NEPA. Any changes to plan components would need to be addressed through a NEPA process including public involvement. Sections were rewritten to better reflect Planning Rule direction.
2	31	MC, HS, EG	Shoshone plan should address local land use plans	Language was added.
4	40	WC	As a general comment, we find the organization of the draft plan a bit cumbersome. We suggest that the plan be arranged topically, rather than broken down into sections based on the plan components. As an example, the topic “forest products” could be addressed all at once and include the desired condition, objectives, etc. in the same section, rather than trying to find information about management and decision guidance regarding forest products in several chapters of the plan.	The three-part plan outline is prescribed by Forest Service Handbook direction.
6	Table 1	EG	This table does not help to clarify the outline on the previous page. How do each of these elements relate to the three categories of sustainability?	Social, economic, and ecological sustainability are integral to all parts of the framework.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
9	22	IDT	<p>The opening to the plan on 'Vision' provides important background for the plan. I suggest adding a closing section (before Chapter 1: Desired Conditions), with a focus on the niche of the Forest. To some extent you have covered niche in the current narrative under vision. However, I wonder if a brief focus on the true niche of the Forest could help define the future of the forest more clearly. Some things I would highlight in a couple paragraphs on niche would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Role the forest plays as the western gateway to Yellowstone NP. Therefore, the forest has an interpretation niche to prepare users - bear education, food storage, interpretation. -Role of the forest in managing the winter and summer range for important herds of ungulates from Yellowstone and providing hunting opportunities important to the management of those herds. -Unique character of the Forest as one of three premiere 'wilderness' Forests (along with Payette and Bitterroot). -Role in management of wolves, bison, grizzly bears, cutthroat trout, and wolverine. 	Niche thoughts are covered in roles and contributions and the Forest's setting sections
9	26	IF	I don't believe the phrase "one of the few remaining relatively intact ecosystems in North America" is accurate, or relevant. I recommend you delete the phrase.	dropped "few"
9	43	MC	On page 9 in the 6 th paragraph there should be a reference to local custom and culture.	We believe it is covered with "local culture" and "local communities."

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
10	42	MC, EG	Up to this point there has been no characterization of the problems and major issues facing the forest, its users, and neighbors. This would be an excellent lead in to the vision statement. We suggest you include a section here called "Challenges and use Conflict Issues." In this section you need to address the scarcity principle, which is a central tenet of sustainability.	These issues are dealt with in the Comprehensive Evaluation Report in the analysis of the need for change in the Forest Plan.
11	7	SF	"A diverse and sustainable flow..." paragraph talks about a sustainable flow of tourism-related businesses. This should be rewritten to make better sense .	Wording changed
11	21	IF	I recommend you delete "and populations" from the first sentence. My understanding is that the Forest Service is not responsible for identifying or maintaining "desired" populations	Wording changed
11	28	EG	Suggested adding "recreation trail use conflicts are minimized."	No change made because "meet the needs of . . . the public" assumes user conflicts are managed.
11	30	EG	Suggested edit. "provide opportunities for people of all abilities"	Wording changed
11	33	EG	Add to end of paragraph " ,though conditions are maintained to minimize fire hazard to local communities"	Wording adjusted
12	12	MC	Background the 3 rd and 4 th paragraphs seems to state opinion rather than facts backed up by scientific data so it may be vest to omit these paragraphs.	These discussions are supported by the watershed analysis in the Comprehensive Evaluation Report.
12	31	EG	Add text: There are numerous watersheds across the forest with older forests capable of supporting high severity wildfires. Fire in these watersheds has potential for negative and positive impacts on water quality and quantity.	Wording added

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
12	33	MC	Though opposed to Federal designation, Meeteetse Conservation District (MCD) recognizes that the Forest needs to address Wild, Scenic & Recreational Rivers in the Plan. However, the Plan is still silent on the contemplation of water storage, even though storage may be severely affected by those Federal designations. Furthermore, the state of Wyoming places an emphasis on developing storage and there are projects identified within the SNF on the Wyoming Water Development Commission's Long List. These two sentences from the Commission's <i>WIND/BIGHORN RIVER BASIN PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</i> are key: "The data presented in the basin report clearly shows that substantial water resources are available in the WBHB for development, but that the distribution and availability of the water resources in the WBHB relative to point of use is highly variable. Without future water projects, which address the development, storage, and distribution of Wyoming's water resources in the WBHB, chronic water shortages in specific localities, will continue."	Water impoundments are now addressed in the water section under provision of goods and services.
12	35	WP	Plan fails to mention Clean Water Act anti-degradation policy	Following the Watershed Conservation Practices handbook meets direction
12	40	EG	Through minimizing connections between human-induced disturbances and stream systems and wetlands, sediment delivery to riparian systems is minimized.	Direction in Watershed Conservation Practices handbook takes into account the natural state of streams and sedimentation.
13	12	SF	The forest is required to maintain Class I and Class II air quality standards, however there is nothing written in the section as to how the Federal land Managers plan on maintaining these standards. How will the pollution from the upwind sources to be managed?	Language was included on our role in responding to off-Forest impacts.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
13	23	EG	Add language about the effects of wildfires in background	Wording added
13	25	WP	Plan fails to mention compliance with PSD increments as standards for class I and II airsheds	Language was included on our role in responding to off-Forest impacts.
13	30	IDT	Expected to see invasive species addressed in the ecosystem diversity portion of plan. I know it is found later in the plan, maybe you should make a reference to it in the diversity section.	Done
13	30	IDT	Aquatic & riparian DCs. I know you treat this topic under species, and you have a physical hydrology section, but would encourage you to have a stronger emphasis on biotic features in the aquatic portion of your ecosystem diversity.	Section on riparian was added under ecosystem diversity. Section on aquatic habitat was added under species diversity. Cross-referencing between the sections was added.
13	30	IDT	In reference to livestock grazing the term rangelands is commonly used in referring to vegetation. Rangelands includes both grassland and shrubland (primarily sagebrush on Shoshone). This needs to be explained.	Clarification paragraph is added to ecosystem background.
13	38	RO	Terminology problem. Plants are species, but vegetation is an assemblage of plants. It is not correct to say "vegetation species."	Wording changed. No longer used at this spot. Rest of document screened for concern.
14	1	IDT	Include limber pine and whitebark pine in discussion of vegetation types.	Done
14	9	MC	The sentence "The distribution of willows has declined due to conifer encroachment..." should also make reference to drought, climate, and wildlife.	Change was made ...conifer encroachment, past livestock and ungulate grazing, and drought

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
14	14	WP	Diversity is only one aspect of ecosystem function. The plan states "Some habitat components... are particularly important... these include mature age classes..." but this list fails to mention two most important components old growth (which is NOT the same as mature age classes) and riparian.	The ecosystem diversity section had a lot of rework. Riparian section was added. Older growth is still addressed in the context of mature forest. On a Forest where the majority of stands are not treated and functions are generally within the historic range of variability, specific old growth components are being provided as part of the mature component. See the Comprehensive Evaluation Report for further information.
14	20	RO	We need more discussion about the statement that desired conditions are best viewed at the forestwide scale. Our experience in the Region has been that desired conditions are best viewed at a smaller area scale.	Text was dropped.
14	28	GF	Recommend adding additional language to address the alpine habitat component of the following concern: key habitat improvement projects are implemented to enhance aspen regeneration, inhibit conifer encroachment, improve sagebrush health, enhance alpine/subalpine habitats, restore riparian systems, and provide a full range of habitat conditions and habitat components on the Forest.	This is asking for language that does not belong in desired conditions. Desired conditions do not describe activities that are to take place; rather they describe the conditions we are trying to achieve. Aspen, encroachment, sagebrush, and riparian are all addressed in the plan. Desired conditions describe what we want, and for some items, objectives identify how aggressively we will attempt to achieve the desired conditions. Regardless of specific objectives during project planning, any project can focus on activities needed to achieve desired conditions. The alpine discussion in the grasslands sections was enhanced.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
15	1	IF	I find the display of existing conditions and Desired conditions in the same table to be very helpful. I generally support the proposed Desired condition percentages. However, I would appreciate your clarifying several details. How will the Desired Conditions be used to guide project planning? Further, how, and how often, do you plan to monitor Current conditions? If a major disturbance causes one or more cover types to go outside the Desired Condition Percentage, what does that mean, i.e. how will that affect continuing implementation of the forest plan and will a forest plan amendment be necessary.	In project planning, desired conditions and objectives would be reviewed to determine what opportunities exist to address those plan components in the project area. Those opportunities would be used to identify a scope and proposed action for the project. For example, we have objectives to increase aspen. If there is aspen or potential aspen sites in a project area, that is one thing the project could address. Of course, the conditions of the area may identify that it not be addressed. If a past disturbance had already set back all the aspen to an early seral stage in an area, we may decide it is not timely to generate additional early seral age stands. Monitoring periods are still being developed. A likely period for vegetation acreages could be as frequent as biannually but will be at least every five years. Given the range of desired conditions, a disturbance that would move stand conditions outside those ranges is probably large enough to require an evaluation on whether plan components are still valid or whether they require amendment. There area also specific desired condition statements for areas that are actively managed.
15	1	RO	I think an additional column showing if an increase or decrease in the cover type is needed for ease of use of the table.	This comment was considered among others in reworking the discussion. The display of the information has been changed and the table was dropped.
15	1	SF	According to this table, the forest is in pretty good shape. It mentions nothing about the Structural/Age Class diversity within the forest. A table depicting the existing and desired conditions by age class or structure would tell a different story. We would like to see an additional table showing that.	Information added on age class.
15	2	SA	Looking for more detail of DC for grassland and sagebrush.	More detail was added.
15	3	IDT	Comments for grasslands	Used
15	3	IDT	Comments for grasslands	Used

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
15	3	NL	Objectives for achieving the desired conditions regarding grasslands are addressed on p. 43, but there are no guidelines. The methods that the Forest Service would like to employ to achieve the stated objectives are of significance to the public. Ideally, a focus on natural processes such as wildfire and simulated natural processes such as controlled burns would be the guidelines of choice.	We have not identified a need for any specific guidelines for this. There are some guidelines associated with species that use this type. The types of activities that might be used are included in the possible actions appendix.
15	7	IDT	Comments for sagebrush	Used
15	8	NL	Objectives for achieving the desired conditions regarding sagebrush are addressed on p. 44, but there are no guidelines. The methods that the Forest Service would like to employ to achieve the stated objectives are of significance to the public. Ideally, a focus on natural processes such as wildfire and simulated natural processes such as controlled burns would be the guidelines of choice.	We have not identified a need for any specific guidelines for this. There are some guidelines associated with species that use this type. The types of activities that might be used are included in the possible actions appendix.
15	9	IDT	Sagebrush should be referred to as various communities	Used
15	16	IDT	Add patches of continuous age classes of sagebrush should be greater than 50 acres with canopy cover between 5 and 25% within treatment areas.	Thoughts used, but more detail was obtained from other sources.
15	17	SF	DCs for species are vague. Should include information on age class DC. DC for stand diversity should also be more developed.	More detail was added.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
15	19	NL	According to the desired conditions discussion, change is desired, and it appears the forest service would like to reduce the presence of Douglas-fir on the forest by a minimum of about 30,000 acres. Objectives and guidelines should be included in the draft plan to suggest how this desired condition might be achieved. The level of management is a concern to the public, as are the methods that will be employed to achieve that objective. Will the Forest Service explain a preference for vegetative treatment vs. fire? Ideally, a focus on natural processes such as wildfire and simulated natural processes such as controlled burns would be the guidelines of choice.	The reworked desired conditions call for a much smaller decrease. Likely activities are displayed in the possible actions appendix. The plan does not prescribe types of specific activities; it only describes the outcomes. Actual activities would be identified at the project level where a more informed choice can be made on tradeoffs, based on site conditions, other management direction for the specific area, and opportunities.
15	19	RO	Identify what the DF acres will change to. Provide an age class for mature.	Age added for mature. What acres will come from depends on site conditions; we did not want to predefine that. Other desired conditions call for increases, so some Douglas-fir acres will probably go for that. This will be one of the items tracked by monitoring and will be addressed through an adaptive management approach. The reworked desired conditions call for a much smaller decrease in Douglas fir.
15	21	IF	I recommend that you revisit and modify the desired percentages of mature age class for Douglas-fir, Spruce/fir, or lodgepole pine. The effect of those percentages is to eliminate any opportunity for commercial timber harvest on the Shoshone NF.	Percentages were further reviewed. These percentages will not impact harvest as they are based on Forest-wide numbers. With the large portion of the Forest being unmanaged, this is not difficult to meet. Much of the forest has the potential to move into this age class in the planning period. Within managed portions of the Forest, the percentage is smaller (10%). A guideline was added in those areas to ensure old growth is distributed across the Forest at some minimum level. The guideline is similar to what was required in the existing Forest Plan on managed lands. The effects of the insect epidemic is on this numbers is being examined with some inventory work this summer.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
16	14	IF	I recommend deleting “it is recognized that some large disturbance events could lower the distribution” from the spruce/fir desired condition and similarly that you delete “while allowing disturbance events that are with the historic range” from the desired condition for lodgepole pine.	Plan has been reworded to address disturbance differently. Insect impacts are still included in the section on insects.
16	16	IF MC	I recommend that you revisit the proposed ages for mature age class and modify them to something along the lines of 120 years for Douglas-fir and spruce/fir and 100 years for lodgepole pine. Based on the local knowledge of persons involved in the timber industry, the MCD asserts that the stated ages of maturity for the mature timber class, 200 years for spruce/fir and Douglas-fir and 150 years for lodgepole pine, are much too high. A range of ages may be a better way to describe age classes.	For the purposes of plan components, the mature age classes are set to achieve the biological structure and attributes we are looking for to provide wildlife habitat. The lower ages account for the tree being mature, but it is unlikely that the other attributes we are looking for would be present. The ages we used are supported by the literature (see ecosystem sustainability report). Another way to look at this is that the age is more about stand age and what results than the age of an individual tree.
16	16	RO	Mention current bark beetle epidemics as an example of a large disturbance event that is actively lowering the distribution of mature Douglas-fir and spruce	Current insect impacts are discussed elsewhere in the document.
16	26	IDT	Various comments on whitebark pine.	Incorporated into discussion
16	27	IDT	I seems like we talked about some more aggressive ideas for moving stands of whitebark pine that occur outside wilderness toward “resistance”. I strongly encourage you to include these in the desired conditions for whitebark pine.	There are some things occurring within the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, but it is still too early to know what will be done and on what Forests. We decided to leave further specific direction out of the plan given the uncertainty. This will have little effect on the actual work done, given the strong focus on whitebark pine management within the GYE. If more information comes out of the work being done this summer in the GYE, direction may be added to the plan.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
16	27	IF RO	<p>I don't disagree with the intent of your desired conditions for whitebark pine, but I do question whether it is realistic to expect "fire disturbance to restrict the spread of white pine blister rust" or "more disease resistant trees on the forest".</p> <p>This sentence regarding fire restricting white pine blister rust is confusing. Fire could encourage the alternate host of white pine blister rust and it will not only remove infected stands but also trees with potential genetic resistance. It could also remove the seed source for an area. Perhaps burned areas would be attractive to nutcrackers dispersing seeds,..... or fire could remove competing forest types for new whitebark pines stands to be established.</p> <p>Either remove or clarify this sentence regarding fire disturbance and blister rust</p>	After further research, the language on fire disturbance and how it relates to blister rust was removed.
16	27	RC RO	<p>Protecting white bark pines from mountain pine beetle attack with preventive insecticide application or anti-aggregation pheromones may be warranted during mountain pine beetle epidemics to preserve genetic diversity from which resistance to white pine blister rust is being developed.</p> <p>Add a statement that mountain pine beetle prevention or suppression strategies may be employed to protect high value stands over 300 years old and on trees that are potentially resistant to white pine blister rust.</p>	Added to the desired condition the desire to protect rust-resistant trees, and added activity to the possible actions appendix.
16	31	RO	States the desired condition for whitebark pine is 40% of stands over 300 years old. This seems unrealistic based on expected stand development with blister rust, beetles, & natural disturbance. Use smaller percentage.	After more discussion and review of forest inventory analysis data, we dropped the age to 200 and the percentage to 25%. This may still be a problem with insect epidemics, but it is a desired condition we want to achieve. After more monitoring, we may have to make a change based on how things are progressing.
17	7	IDT	Comments on willow	Incorporated

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
17	7	IDT	Say various willow communities	Change made
17	12	IF IDT	I support the mature age class desired condition. However, this desired condition does not appear to be synchronized with the ecosystem diversity guideline starting on p68. I question the utility of the general desired condition for mature stands. The extremely general nature of this desired condition results in more confusion than clarity.	This section was dropped. The mature discussion was incorporated into each cover type discussion. The guideline remains the same.
17	12	NL	It would be useful for the benefits to wildlife of "mature age classes" and "stand diversity" to be expressed.	Additional information is provided. Throughout the ecosystem section, references were added to the species of interest and species of concern that use specific cover type conditions. In addition, further information of species use of habitats is addressed in the species reports.
17	15	SF RO IDT	The DFC For Stand Diversity could also be more thoroughly developed. If the DFC for age class distribution is not identified and the DFC for each species is at or below the HRV for that species, you have effectively stated that there will be no timber harvest activities in the forest for the duration of the plan. Stand diversity desired condition is fairly meaningless. The desired condition related to forest stand density and age is too vague.	Section was dropped. More detail was added to individual species sections.
17	21	IDT IF	Need better description of snag changes over time as they relate to mgmt and disturbances. Discussion isn't very meaningful. Look at comments on snag guidelines.	Section was rewritten
17	21	NL	For this category, it would be useful for the benefits of "snags" to wildlife could be expressed.	References were added to species of concern and interest that use snags as a major habitat component.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
17	21	RO	This DC does not seem consistent with concerns related to spruce beetle and other beetle epidemics. Recommend changing this to endemic insect and fire at disturbances are within HRV and socially acceptable (or some other wording).	Section was rewritten. The fire sections address issues with snags near infrastructure and other fuels related issues. Socially acceptable is more of a value judgment; we are writing desired conditions to be more ecologically based.
17	25	RO	Add lightening strikes to the last sentence of this paragraph.....”such as lightening strikes, insect outbreaks and fire.....	Change made
17	29	NL	A quantitative analysis of existing fens should be conducted, and fens should be protected. The information currently presented does not provide data on present fen health and states of degradation.	Additional information was added on what is known.
17	32	RO	Consider revising last sentence to make it clear that invasive species are not in fens under your DC.	Done
17	32	RO	Achievement of full ‘unimpeded’ status is probably not feasible in many instances. Find a better word to denote management of the fens to sustain their natural processes in spite of occasional impacts.	Wording was adjusted. We do have some impacts that may not be possible to eliminate, such as the impact the Beartooth Highway has on one fen. Language was added to the management approach to address focus.
18	7	IDT	The discussion of forest stands for timber production doesn’t appear to be informed by an understanding of what types of timber products are desired. Therefore, it provides little understanding of the desired ecological condition for these areas. If you wish to produce wood biomass or fiber for paper, your desired condition should be very different from stands intended to produce house logs vs. dimensional lumber. Maybe the interest is only post-and-poles - then the desired condition will be pretty different. I suspect that industrial infrastructure and current industry interests could focus the discussion considerably.	We do not want to be that specific. Product choice is difficult to make at this time. Postponing a product decision allows for a better balance between production and other ecosystem services vs. targeting a specific product. We are deferring the product decision until the project level, where there will be better information on timing and opportunity.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
18	13	RO	DC for timber is discussed in terms of rotation age, which is an even-aged term. Need to include uneven-aged management counterparts. Add uneven-aged terminology such as desired maximum diameter, Q, and basal area.	Added some wording
18	16	IF	The first section starting with "Stand structure" needs edited.	Done
18	40	RO	I think the Plan needs to say more specifically about Desired Conditions for aquatic species and habitats.	Aquatics section was added and additional cross reference to other direction was added.
18	40	WP	This section does not provide any of the accountability needed to protect these species.	This section, along with the ecosystem report, species report, and other plan components, provide the framework for supporting these species on the Forest.
19	4	IDT	Reword text: the Forest's elevation changes, climate, biogeographic setting, and geology	Text modified to reflect the Shoshone's position in the Rockies, which leads to the occurrence of northern and southern species at latitudes where they would not normally be expected.
19	5	RO	I suggest referring to the "wide range of elevations" on the Forests.	Wording changed
19	8	MC	Are there other citations to be made on Page 19 (Desired Conditions)? "Supporting evidence for species diversity desired conditions can be found in the Shoshone National Forest Ecological Sustainability Report (USDA Forest Service 2007)"	Additional citations are found in the Ecological Sustainability Report.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
19	12	IF	Starting with "Ecological conditions" - the Shoshone NF does not constitute the entire range of most threatened and endangered species and species of concern. Therefore, ecological conditions on the Shoshone NF will, at best, contribute to recovery and contribute to avoiding federal listing. I recommend you re-write the paragraph along the lines of "Ecological conditions exist to contribute to recovery of threatened and endangered species, to contribute to avoiding federal listing ..."	Comments incorporated
19	15	IF	I recommend you modify the paragraph as follows "...full range of native and desired non-native wildlife and plants".	Comments incorporated
19	18	EG	<p>Reword Text:</p> <p>Habitat Connectedness</p> <p>Patterns of vegetation are within the HRV. Elk migration corridors provide an inherent degree of connectivity, which allows elk to move from summer to winter range. Vegetation patterns vary across the landscape spatially and temporally, providing different levels of security within these elk migration corridors</p> <p>Highways and National Forest System roads do not impede big game and riparian species movement during seasonal use. Infrastructure is designed and located to allow movement of big game and riparian species. Some secure habitat occurs in elk migration corridors to facilitate big game movement.</p>	Plan component is not directed solely at big game; some small changes were made.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
19	18	IDT	I assume you provide more detailed desired conditions for connectivity within certain geographic area descriptions. I suggest making a note of that at the end of the connectivity discussion. I say that because I assume you pay particular attention to movement of certain elk herds from Yellowstone and bighorn sheep movement in the Wind Rivers.	Additional information was added to the background section for connectivity.
19	18	IF	I am concerned that the Desired Condition for Connectivity corridors could adversely affect management and access of the Shoshone NF. What is really the intent of "Connectivity corridors provide an inherent degree of connectivity, which allows animals to move across a landscape?" what species on the Shoshone NF really require connectivity corridors? What is "an inherent degree of connectivity"?	Information was added to the management approach to address the focus for this desired condition.
19	19	NL	There should be a mention about efforts to restore historic corridors.	To the best of our knowledge, this is not an issue on the Shoshone.
19	21	WC	Please add "adequate forage" after the word "security" in the sentence, "Vegetation patterns vary across the landscape spatially and temporally, providing different levels of security within these connectivity corridors." We ask that the sentence read: "Vegetation patterns vary across the landscape spatially and temporally, providing different levels of security and adequate forage within these connectivity corridors."	We dropped the reference to security, so we did not add forage. The reason is that to provide connectivity, the vegetation has to provide the elements of security, forage, or whatever else is needed. Security is still highlighted in the next paragraph, since it is more of a limiting factor than forage.
19	25	GF	Connectivity Corridors: National Forest system roads do not impede big game, riparian, and fish movement during seasonal use.	Wording added

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
19	29	NL	For species of interest such as bighorn sheep and for big game such as elk, adequate protections should be in place to limit motorized recreation and timber production/harvest on winter habitat in the summer months to protect the winter food supply. In the winter when a herd is already stressed, motorized use should be kept to a minimum where deemed necessary, and eliminated elsewhere within winter range.	It is not clear how motorized use (which is limited to designated routes) and timber harvest in the summer would affect winter food supply. Winter range is generally not forested. Motorized travel is restricted on winter range in the winter.
19	30	GF	Therefore, we strongly recommend this gate closure, as well as the others, remain intact and are enforced. We also recommend these closures be documented in the Plan revision, and stated that they will be utilized to restrict motorized use within these areas.	This level of specificity is not included in the plan. This will more appropriately be dealt with in a travel management decision. Direction is included in the plan components on motorized access in winter range.
19	30	GF	We recommend adding a desired condition statement and accompanying objective to address the following: Big game parturition areas are maintained/enhanced through habitat treatments, protection from new roads, and where necessary, seasonal closures to various activities.	Parturition areas were added into the winter range section

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
19	31	BD	<p>The Desired Condition for winter ranges should generally be changed to reflect a goal of providing seasonal closure of roads in these areas from November 15 to April 30, of discouraging snowmobile use and nonmotorized traffic in these areas, and of preventing new road construction in winter ranges. The road density guidelines, while a fine goal, do not address the full and direct cause of wildlife disturbance, which is the presence of vehicles or nonmotorized incursions by people. The Bridger-Teton National Forest has developed a laudable model for limitations on human traffic in winter ranges, and this model should be adopted into the Shoshone National Forest's new plan.</p>	<p>Motorized travel is restricted on winter range in the winter. Non-motorized use has not been identified as a general winter range problem on the Shoshone. Site-specific decisions will address localized problems.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
19	31	GF	<p>Big Game Winter Range (specifically list elk, moose, bighorn sheep, mountain goats):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crucial big game winter ranges are managed to provide necessary forage, water, and cover to meet strategic plan herd unit objectives agreed upon with WGFD in WGFD/USFS MOUs. • Crucial big game winter ranges are free from human disturbance, including motorized travel, during the winter period, except for necessary administrative access; forest roads and trails are generally closed to motorized travel through crucial big game winter ranges. • Crucial big game winter ranges are fenced only minimally, and with fence designs that are wildlife-friendly. • Crucial big game winter ranges are either not leased, or leased for oil/gas and minerals only with proper protections for wintering wildlife and adequate mitigation for any impacts that may occur. WGFD's document, "<i>Recommendations for Development of Oil and Gas Resources within Crucial and Important Wildlife Habitats</i>", is used as a source of best management practices for dealing with development on crucial big game ranges. • Noxious weed invasions are adequately identified and addressed on crucial big game winter ranges. • Desired forage condition and plant diversity are maintained on transitional big game ranges. • An effective public relations/education campaign on travel management and seasonal closures has been implemented. Enforcement of travel management is a high priority for the Shoshone National Forest. • Livestock grazing on crucial big game winter ranges is managed so that forage quality and/or quantity is adequate or improved for wintering big game 	<p>*Do not see the need to list the species. Management direction will apply to areas assigned in the plan regardless of the species involved.</p> <p>*We discuss forage and secure habitat. Water was added to the desired conditions. Direction on herd objectives is not included in the plan since there is no process by which the Forest Service officially agrees on those objectives. The plan does recognize the cooperation that occurs with the Game and Fish Department in connection with population management responsibilities.</p> <p>*Direction is provided on motorized use restrictions. Dispersed use is allowed, but not encouraged.</p> <p>*Fence guidelines are provided for all fences. No guideline on minimizing fencing is included. Minimum fencing is generally a standard operating procedure on the Shoshone.</p> <p>*This document is not being referenced in the plan. Input from the document is welcomed and will be considered during project planning. The document will not become part of plan direction. Plan components for minerals in winter range are included.</p> <p>*Did not add anything specific for noxious weeds in winter range. This is a concern across the Forest and there are other areas that may be important also. That should be addressed at the project level.</p> <p>*Nothing specific on transitional ranges. Desired conditions are the same for all areas of the Forest. It is covered under other vegetation direction</p> <p>*Discussion on travel management occurs elsewhere</p> <p>*There is a guideline.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
19	31	WP	Abundance of forage in connection to livestock is not addressed	A guideline for winter range addresses the quantity of forage on winter range in connection to livestock grazing.
19	34	DI	Wildlife winter ranges be free of motorized travel both summer and winter.	Motorized travel is restricted on winter range in the winter. Restrictions in the summer are not included in the plan components. If restrictions exist on winter range in the summer, they are imposed for some other reason than winter range.
19	36	NL	Desired conditions should include better protections for winter habitat. The plan currently states, "Some motorized access provides opportunities for wildlife viewing... Dispersed recreation use occurs, but is not encouraged." How exactly is recreation discouraged? We would prefer to see most winter range closed to winter motorized access.	We will not discourage dispersed recreation use. By not encouraging, we will not be directing people or signing areas/trails as good places to go during the time winter range is in use by wildlife. Dispersed use is not prohibited, but we will not be managing it to increase or become a destination. Most winter range is closed to motorized, but there are a few areas where all-season access roads provide some opportunities for viewing.
20	4	IF	I like the concept of implementing wildlife security by 6 th order watersheds. However, I recommend they you clarify several details: -does the secure habitat desired condition apply year-round or just during the fall hunting season? -Sentence #2 If migration corridors occur in watersheds with low or very low secure habitat, doesn't that undermine the importance of secure habitat? -Regarding footnote 16, are there watersheds with a low percentage of National Forest System lands, and if so, should those watersheds be excluded?	Secure habitat for big game is calculated with seasonal closures. Though a concern year round, the desired conditions for a number of watersheds in each secure habitat class were calculated when roads are closed. This covers the winter and spring seasons when secure habitat is most important to the species. Wording was adjusted to make this clear. -No, sometimes there are only limited options for corridors; it is just that the security is low. There is a definitive observable effect of low secure habitat along a migration corridor. Direction is designed to address that. -That is what the footnote addresses. After looking at the watersheds, we used acres instead of percentages to categorize the ones that should be excluded. Given the low fragmentation of ownership on the Shoshone, it is just the watersheds on the edge of the Forest that fall into this category.
20	9	GF	Secure Habitat: Rather than a footnote to the Hillis methodology, the desired condition for secure habitats could be better explained.	Moved secure habitat definition into the desired condition.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
20	11	GF	In watersheds currently assessed as “low” or “very low security” (e.g., Dunoir, Warm Springs Creek, Horse Creek) travel and vegetative management are designed to elevate security levels.	The management approach states that focus is on improving secure habitat in areas with low or very low security. The desired condition also leads to moving at least one watershed to the moderate category. The management approach addresses possible actions in low security areas.
20	19	IDT	I suggest you contact Nancy Warren to discuss plan direction for T&E species. Although 2005 rule plans are not to repeat direction in recovery plans, I want to make sure there aren't 'Forest Specific' desired conditions that are NOT described explicitly in the recovery plans that should be listed in your plan.	Threatened/endangered species sections were reworked.
20	22	IF	The forest plan should not imply implementation of the Lynx conservation assessment and strategy. The forest plan could either acknowledge the Lynx Conservation agreement between the Forest Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service or acknowledge the proposed plan amendment for lynx.	Rewritten to tie to the Forest Plan amendment for lynx
21	6	EG	Add text: While a few individuals may be present on the Forest, there is no current evidence of a reproducing population. The potential for recovery to non-listed status is low for several reasons: 1) current levels of foraging habitat (seedling/sapling stands) are far below the HRV; 2) the high percentage of wilderness/roadless areas and current agency emphasis on fire suppression will tend to preclude the recruitment of a sustainable level of seedling/sapling stands which are needed by lynx for foraging; and 3) current long-term trends in climatic warming will favor other competing predators (coyotes, bobcats) over lynx.	Section has been rewritten, but is not really consistent with the comments here. Lynx have been documented on the Shoshone and reproducing lynx have been documented in northwest Wyoming. Based on the existence of current suitable habitat on the Shoshone, it makes sense to continue to manage for this threatened species. In response to the fire comment, current agency policy is to incorporate more fire into fire-dependent ecosystems. Climate warming may have long-term implications for the populations, but the implications are unknown at this time. This does not relieve us from the obligation to continue providing habitat in the near term. The bottom line is that we will follow the recent plan amendment

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
21	6	IF	The forest plan should not cite the Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment Draft EIS as “Other Direction”. First, an EIS statement does not contain direction. Second, the amendment is not final, and a draft cannot contain direction.	Rewritten to reference the Record of Decision
21	31	BD	We believe that the timber wolf, grizzly bear, and wolverine should be added as Species of Concern. The grizzly bear and wolf may soon lose Endangered Species Act protection, making it even more important for the Forest Service to provide strong protections through the planning process. We fully support the expansion of all native species to the fullest extent of their native range; at the same time, species should not be introduced into areas where they are non-native, as the ecological disruption caused by the introduction of a non-native species, even if desirable from a recreational standpoint, can be disastrous.	The grizzly bear and gray wolf are species of concern, now that they are delisted. A need has not been identified to have specific plan components for the wolf. The wolverine does not meet the criteria for species of concern. Ecological conditions for the wolverine are represented well by direction for lynx and grizzly bear.
21	31	WP	Species of Concern: the wording here allows far less protection with the removal of “trend toward” and while it is true that ecological conditions drive species to extinction, it is more accurately activities undertaken or permitted by the FS that drive species towards extinction. The list fails to account for many of the R2 Sensitive Species.	One of the screens used in assessing species for the list is what activities are conducted on the Forest that could impact the species. Those that make the list are more specifically addressed. The process and criteria for sensitive species are different from the process and criteria for species of concern. There is some overlap between the lists, but they are definitely different. Sensitive species were included in the initial screening process to ensure they were considered.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
21	42	RO	“Ecological conditions” again, but this time I’m wondering about management actions. You say the DC is that ecological conditions do not lead to federal listing of species of concern. What about management actions leading to listing (e.g., herbicide use)? The DC is for SOC, so I assume that you want to prevent the need for listing by maintaining appropriate ecological conditions. But it is not clear to me that you have encompassed the possible adverse consequences of management actions (even those aimed at maintaining ecological conditions).	We do not see the need to change this. If management action is causing an impact, it is because it is affecting an ecological condition. It would seem the statement is all-encompassing to any impacts.
22	3	IDT	I strongly suggest adding concepts related to movement barriers to the desired conditions for Yellowstone Cutthroat trout. Furthermore, I would suggest that desired conditions related to New Zealand mud snails would also be appropriate. See page 22 for suggestions.	Movement barriers are addressed in habitat connectivity and implied in objectives. Mud snails are mentioned under invasives.
22	3	IF	This and several other desired conditions refer to conditions at the time of Plan approval. To avoid confusion, I recommend that you clarify whether you are referring to 1986, when the first forest plan for the Shoshone National forest was approved, or to the date when the forest plan revision is approved.	Done
22	3	IDT	Comments on YSC: Aquatic habitat conditions are stable or improving in order to support well-distributed, self sustaining populations of native aquatic fish species including ysc. Cooperation and coordination with state, federal, and tribal agencies and other groups ensures the upward trend for native fish species, especially ysc.	A section on aquatic habitats was added. Cooperation is covered in the management approach.
22	32	IDT	Footnote 20. Add carbonate to definition.	Done

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
23	3	NL	When a species of concern is present, this should affect the suitable uses in a given area. Therefore, an area with known populations of Absaroka goldenweed should not overlay a <i>general forest</i> setting. A backcountry non-motorized setting would ensure adequate protection where Absaroka goldenweed is present.	The species assessment identifies what types of activities may impact a species of concern. Based on the assessment, guidelines were added to protect the species if other plan components are not sufficient. This is included in the Comprehensive Evaluation Report. It is not necessary to preclude all activities. The guideline will focus on what needs to be considered.
23	3	RO	"process" should say "processes".	Done
23	6	BD	The Species of Interest category should be expanded to include the American marten in order to reflect terrestrial species with a high requirement for mature, closed-canopy forest and the connectivity of this habitat type. We feel that the goshawk, while an excellent indicator species in its own right, does not cover dispersal issues for interior forest species due to its ability to fly long distances over unsuitable habitats.	Species of interest are selected based on a need for additional plan components beyond what is provided for by the ecosystem diversity plan components. A need was not identified for the marten. This habitat condition does not seem to be limited on the Shoshone.
23	10	RO	Consider adding populations ("Ecological conditions sustain habitats and populations of species of interest.")	Section was rewritten
23	10	WC	Please explain the goal of managing for species of interest. Unlike the goal for T&E species which is to recover them and the goal for species of concern, which is to avoid federal listing it is not clear what the desired outcome of managing is. Does the FS hope to retain the mere presence of these species, manage populations at present or ideal numbers or something different entirely?	The Forest Service Handbook states there are species that management actions may be necessary or desirable to achieve ecological or other multiple use objectives. This information has been incorporated.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
23	13	EG IDT	Reword text: Northern goshawk nesting habitat is found in mature stands of lodgepole pine, Douglas-fir, and aspen, and foraging habitat is found within a mix of forested age classes and non-forest openings. Let's talk with Nancy and Peter regarding desired conditions for northern goshawk. It seems that we can give specifics regarding human disturbance, some characteristics of nesting habitat, and particularly characteristics to support woodpeckers, squirrels, and grouse to support diverse prey populations.	Wording was modified
23	21	IDT	Desired conditions for beaver can be expanded to specifically identify the conditions suitable for beaver. Also, the desired conditions can include culverts that don't 'ask' beaver to put in a dam and therefore require trapping efforts. See comments on pg 23].	Some modification to the desired condition was made. The culvert issue is not a big concern on the Shoshone.
23	25	IDT	Wonder if desired conditions for amphibians should include ideas related to integrity of wetland hydrology and the probability of trampling for breeding ponds. I have some ideas in the text.	Desired conditions for riparian habitat and riparian group should cover this.
23	25	WP	By the use of the word "occurrences" and "occupied" for frogs, toads, and voles you are firstly, requiring adequate surveys which most likely will never occur and secondly you limit protections for these imperiled species to the few currently documented sites. This is certainly not what most anyone would consider leadership in conservation.	The desired conditions are focused on where the species are, but the guidelines included are broader in context and are not dependent upon occurrence. Much of the protection of habitat is provided by the Watershed Conservation Practices Handbook (BMPs). Those measures apply forestwide and are not limited to where these species occur.
23	28	EG	Reword text: Stream banks known to have habitat occupied by water voles have levels of compaction and sedimentation no higher than that expected from wild ungulates.	Direction was modified to focus on vegetation cover and direction in the Watershed Conservation Practices Handbook. This direction is what is currently being used to protect these species.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
23	28	GF	Desired condition for riparian group: The last paragraph should read: "Stream banks known or suspected to have habitat occupied by water voles . . ."	Direction has been reworked, with an acknowledgement that watershed conservation practices are applied in all riparian areas.
24	3	EG	Reword text: Snags occur within all tree cover types, are distributed throughout the landscape, and commonly occur as temporary pulses after wildfires or insect outbreaks	Concept incorporated
24	3	IDT	Seems we thought of some ideas regarding snags that would deal with the patchy nature of snags, the ephemeral nature of the structures, the size and extent of fires, and the need to manage snags at broad spatial scales.	Rewritten
24	6	EG	Drop sage grouse -- Sage grouse habitat is a insignificant component on the SNF in terms of sustaining the population on a state-wide basis (see WGFD comments).	It is true that what happens with sage grouse on the Shoshone will not greatly influence what happens to the species in the state, but the sage grouse does use the Forest. We are to provide habitat for a range of species, and there are long-term concerns with the population. For these reasons, it is important for the Forest to provide some contribution to sustaining the species.
24	8	NL	When a species of interest is present, it makes sense that this would affect the suitable uses in a given area. Therefore, an area with known populations of sage grouse should not overlay a <i>general forest</i> setting, which is frequently the case. Ideally, a backcountry non-motorized setting would be the applied where sage grouse is present.	The species assessment identifies what types of activities may impact a species of interest and why the species was identified as a species of interest. Based on the assessment, guidelines were added to protect the species if other plan components are not sufficient. This is included in the Comprehensive Evaluation Report. It is not necessary to preclude all activities. The guideline will focus on what needs to be considered.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
24	14	EG	<p>Since you have elk corridors mapped and winter range objectives, it seems logical that the SNF should have some desired conditions for elk. Add the following:</p> <p>Elk occur at population levels sufficient to support a substantial recreational outfitting industry, provide traditional high quality hunting experiences, and support non-consumptive viewing opportunities. To the degree possible, elk winter on national forest land and have minimal impacts on adjacent private ranches.</p> <p>Because elk forage is disturbance-dependent, treatments including logging, pre-commercial thinning, slashing, prescribed burning, and wildland fire use are applied at frequent intervals to maintain a desired mix of forage and security in naturally appearing patterns. In order to sustain this optimal mix of vegetative conditions, some treatments prior to the culmination of mean annual increment (CMAI) are acceptable.</p> <p>Dispersed motorized and non-motorized recreation activities occur during the summer months, although some local restrictions are acceptable to create a mix of recreational opportunities. Some winter restrictions on motorized recreational activities are imposed to minimize disturbance to wintering ungulates.</p>	<p>Issues on secure habitat, winter range, and habitat connectivity are addressed under those topics. Elk were selected primarily for social and economic sustainability reasons. That reasoning has been added to a desired condition for elk.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
24	16	BD GF IDT EG	<p>For bighorn sheep, the Plan should express a Desired Condition that bighorn sheep and domestic sheep do not overlap in their habitat use, in order to minimize the danger of disease transmission that could wipe out the bighorns (see Schommer and Woolever 2001).</p> <p>Bighorn sheep on the majority of the Shoshone NF (in core, native BHS herd units, as defined by WGFD) are not exposed to potential disease transmission from domestic sheep (grazing) or domestic goats (grazing, weed control, recreational packing).</p> <p>There is a minimal risk of disease transmission from domestic livestock to wild bighorn sheep in core range of the Forest.</p> <p>Add text: Bighorn sheep have no exposure to domestic sheep and goats. Diseases from domestic sheep and goats are minimal and population changes resulting from domestic sheep diseases are not detectable over time.</p>	Direction was added to plan components.
24	16	EG	<p>Add text: Because bighorn sheep thrive in habitats that are largely nonforested, treatments including slashing, prescribed burning, and wildland fire use are applied at frequent intervals to maintain open, non-forested conditions. Although bighorn sheep habitat is generally unsuitable for timber harvest, commercial timber harvest is applied in occasional situations to facilitate prescribed burning and wildland fire use, and to improve habitat connectivity between areas of high bighorn sheep habitat suitability.</p>	Discussing how more than what we want. Some additional dc was added. Made link to corridors.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
24	16	IDT	I would suggest that we know enough about bighorn sheep to make their desired conditions statement more specific. In particular, I think folks in the Winds are aware of some critical passage areas. These should be specifically named as areas to remain 'forest free'. Then, the issue of disease seems like it should be highlighted - something like "wild sheep remain completely isolated from contact with domestic sheep."	Disease issue is addressed. Whiskey mt sheep corridor is noted.
24	16	NL	Winter habitat for Bighorn Sheep should also be addressed in desired conditions. There is room for more direction in this plan regarding the protection of wildlife winter range.	Winter range is covered under big game winter range.
24	23	NL	It is good to see that Hall's Fescue will be managed on the forest, but without any maps that have been made available regarding the current distribution of this plant, it is difficult to tell if this desired condition is being adequately addressed.	Description of where species occurs was added.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
24	23	WP RO RO	Halls Fescue and Montane Plant Group: Here again the FS provides conservation leadership. "Satisfactory or better"? Does this mean that as long as the "range condition" is good, we don't care about the conditions of the populations of this species? Or does satisfactory range condition automatically imply self-sustaining populations of Hall's fescue? I doubt the average reader would understand that to be true. Consider adding to the sentence to say something like, "Where Hall's fescue occurs on the Forest, range conditions are satisfactory or better, and populations of Hall's fescue are healthy." Use of the term 'satisfactory condition' or similar terms relative to 'rangeland condition.' Just make sure to define the term.	Wording was adjusted so that it matches current management direction, which is being used to maintain rangeland health.
24	27	RO	Same concern as above for SOC and "ecological conditions" not being the only issue.	Same response as above
25	1	NL	As with other species of interest, it would be beneficial for the forest to provide maps of the three species listed above. It would also be beneficial to see in the maps of settings that know dispersions of these plant groups are taken into account.	Maps or habitat description will be provided for plant species of interest.
25	3	RO	See comment about Howard's alpine forgetmenot above regarding adequacy of "ecological conditions".	Same response as above
25	11	RO	See comment above about Hall's fescue. Is satisfactory range condition adequate? I'm just concerned that we could have terrific range conditions, but that wouldn't necessarily include self-sustaining populations of these species.	Same response as above
25	15	IDT	Edits to opening paragraph.	Comments incorporated

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
26	3	WP	This section states that there are 5,000 acres of invasives on the Forest but then later states 2,000 acres are treated annually. Either these figures are wrong or your control methods are totally ineffective or your actions are creating vast new areas of infestation.	New write-up puts numbers in context.
26	8	RO	Gypsy moths do not “exist” in the Greater Yellowstone Area,....male moths may occasionally be detected in monitoring traps but these are likely emerging from cocoons on vehicle or recreational equipment from the eastern US. Change sentence to “....such as gypsy moth and New Zealand mud snails have been detected in the Greater Yellowstone Area but are not established on the Shoshone	Done
26	13	IDT	Seems that blister rust has the potential to influence species composition, ecological function, and important T&E species. Thought the forest had discussed some desired conditions related to blister rust. Maybe the thoughts have been moved to guidelines but I encourage efforts to set some desired conditions.	Desired conditions are tied to whitebark and limber pine desired conditions.
26	13	RO	No mention of post large fire	No emphasis is provided in plan direction. This is not a particular issue on the Shoshone for most species. Some language was added to the background section that addresses cheatgrass, which is an exception.
27	17	MC	The sentence that talks about the dramatic increase in insects should include a mention on the decrease in logging activity as one of the causes in addition to the listed ones of drought, mild winters, and mature forests.	Logging can have an effect on insects in a local area. Given the limited amount of the Shoshone that is available for logging, the decrease in logging has had a negligible impact to the epidemic on a Forest-wide scale. At a smaller scale, there may be some effect, but the epidemic has even affected areas that have been logged.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
27	17	SF	The plan should emphasize that with the direction the forest is going in regard to the major infestations, there needs to be a much more proactive approach to this problem. In areas where timber harvest is suitable, the Forest Service should manage as many acres as possible in an attempt to get ahead of the beetles.	Wording was added to emphasize proactive management.
27	31	SF	In wilderness and some roadless areas we have no influence over the insect populations, but if we can manage the rest of the forest to prevent such occurrences, shouldn't that become a priority.	On those portions of the Forest where management is consistent with desired conditions, the desired condition is to have vegetative conditions that are less susceptible to insect outbreaks.
27	36	EG	Say within HRV instead of natural levels	We think the use of natural levels reads better here and means essentially the same thing.
27	41	NL	When salvage is recommended as a technique for insect and pathogen control, this should be supported with objectives and guidelines. Objectives should address the acreage to be managed and how, and guidelines should address alternatives to salvage, as well as recognizing a need to balance timber harvest with watershed health. Guidelines should also address protection of understory, impacts on the ground, and erosion control during salvage efforts.	Salvage is a potential activity. Plan components do not prescribe what activities will occur to meet desired conditions. Salvage can be used if it is the appropriate tool for meeting a desired condition. It may be used to meet a number of objectives or desired conditions such as producing volume, reducing fuels, or restoring some condition. The salvage will still be bound by the other plan direction that limits where harvest can occur and guidelines that protect other resources such as soil and water.
27	43	RO	A reduction of stand density is also desired in these areas.	Wording adjusted
27	45	EG	Language suggested emphasizing active management to achieve the condition.	Desired conditions describe outcomes, not how the outcomes are achieved. The wording was adjusted so it is clear what conditions are wanted in these areas, and that the conditions are not wanted only in the portions of those areas that happen to be actively managed. In addition, some language was added to the management approach to convey the desired message.
28	4	IDT	Suggest the discussion refer to cover types to provide a better connection to the ecosystem diversity section of the plan.	Wording was added

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
28	4	SC	The use of the FRCC classification system to “restore fire adapted ecosystems” is a flawed approach which should be rejected for any proposed vegetative management.	As pointed out, there are some shortcomings to the fire regime/condition class system, but the bottom line is that it is important to get fire back into the ecosystem at some naturally occurring level. Fire regime/condition class provides a methodology for prioritizing that task. Fire regime/condition class objectives on the Shoshone will be met primarily with fire. The opportunity for using mechanical vegetation treatment on the Shoshone to achieve fire regime/condition class conditions is relatively limited and is used mostly as a tool to help introduce fire on a larger portion of the landscape. Using mechanical treatments usually results in achieving goals and objectives in addition to fire regime/condition class
28	5	EG	Suggest that first sentence is referring to frequent periodic, not just periodic fires.	The frequency we are talking about is 30 to 100 years. To some, that does not seem frequent. The need sentence that was added to this section, and the later sections provide more context.
28	5	MC	Resilience to fire disturbance should also discuss the decrease in logging activities having an impact due to an increase in fuels materials.	This section is focused on fire’s natural impact on the landscape in terms of how often a stand would typically burn. Decreased logging is not having an effect on prolonging fire return intervals. Logging is a tool in some local areas to address the effects of less periodic fire. The point made is related more to the fuels discussion in the next section of the plan.
28	11	EG	Other symptoms are changes in species composition, reduction in desirable cover types (aspen)	Both these reasons state the same thing in different ways. The first item was added.
28	24	EG	Suggest changing scale reference from watersheds to forest planning process levels.	We decided to drop the language about scale in the paragraph. It was not necessary for the discussion.
29	6	IF	Dc is meaningless and could be deleted.	We believe the desired condition is needed. We suggest a review of the chapter 2 companion section for this topic to provide context.
29	6	IDT	Dc doesn’t seem to account for the need to manage certain areas to reduce the probability of fire. Campgrounds, boundaries, structures, some habitat, etc.	This is addressed in the desired condition for fire and fuels management.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
30	24	RO	Paragraph speaks to increases in developments adjacent to NFS lands but not within.	Wording was changed so that it applies to National Forest System land and not to the Forest boundary.
31	15	BD	We encourage a let-burn policy outside the wildland urban interface. Fuels reduction and fire suppression should not be pursued outside the WUI as outlined above.	The section on fire resiliency addresses desired conditions to increase the natural role of fire. The management approach for this topic prioritizes wildland urban interface and other high valued areas for fuels treatment. The plan allows for fuel treatments in other areas when project planning identifies that treatment is needed to meet desired conditions.
31	15	MC	First sentence should include economic	Changed
31	15	RO	Neither section or map 10 reflects other valuable resources such as power lines, tower sites, etc. Why not include them unless there are none.	These are not mapped. Wording was revised so they are included in direction.
31	22	IDT	The dc suggests that all timber lands suitable for timber production are valuable resources to be protected from fire. I question whether it should be all suitable timber lands, depending on forest plan direction for timber management. Some of those lands many not be intended for timber harvest and therefore spending dollars to protect from fire many not be appropriate.	Perhaps timber production and timber harvest land categories are being confused. Lands designated for timber production are those where the desired condition is to manage for timber products on a sustainable basis. That category is appropriately included in the statement.
31	26	EG	Add The SNF coordinates with local and state agency fire officials for fuels reduction projects within WUI and utilize direction and priorities from community wildfire protection plans. Fuels reduction work results in a net reduction of hazardous conditions within wui over time. Where wui overlap with ira, treatments will utilize technologies that do not require construction of permanent roads.	Community wildfire protection plans and cooperation are addressed in the management approach. Reduction is addressed by the objective in chapter 2 Direction is not necessary. New permanent roads are not allowed in portions of inventoried roadless areas designated as back country or within 2001 RAREII areas.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
31	40	EG	Add The SNF maintains an aggressive public education program to help private landowners adjacent to public land understand local fire hazards on their property, access roads, and recommend treatments.	This is not something that fits in a desired condition plan component. Some wording was added to the management approach
32	21	EG	Reword text: Developed facilities on the Shoshone include 32 campgrounds, 11 picnic grounds, 18 permitted lodges, 262 miles of designated snowmobile trails, and 40 miles of designated cross country ski trails. The recreation program manages 29 miles of designated motorized trails, 1,389 miles of hiking and stock horse trails, and 28 trailheads, which provide access to back country areas.	Changed
32	44	EG	Suggested an example be added about excellent ice climbing on the south fork.	Do not believe an example is needed. Examples in the previous sentence include ice climbing.
33	17	WC	Concern with statement - "In some areas, motorized travel routes provide motorized access into back country areas."	This wording was awkward and did a poor job of describing the situation. Wording was changed to better reflect what is being described.
33	19	HS	The roadless areas should have roads that can be used for management purposes, such as the control of disease, fire, search & rescue, forest surveys, and/or other similar uses.	By definition, back country areas do not contain roads.
36	8	RO	What is the number of active claims on the forest.	Added
36	26	HS	The plan must not only consider but it should attempt to improve the well being of the social, economic, custom and culture of the local area.	We think using the sustainability wording is best. To include language on improving implies there is agreement on what would be an improvement. What is an improvement for one group of individuals may not be an improvement for another group. Between the language of sustainability we use here and the emphasis on collaboration, we have other places we believe the plan covers what is needed.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
36	38	WC	We recognize that the areas deemed suitable for either timber production or timber harvest have yet to be decided. We urge the Forest Service to find that inventoried roadless areas (those surveyed in RARE II and the additional acreage mapped in 2006) are not suitable for timber production. Of these inventoried roadless areas, please also find that they may be suitable for timber harvest only if they meet one of the criteria in the 2001 Roadless Rule.	Suitable uses indicates that timber production is not suitable in back country areas. The plan looks at broader issues than whether the area is within the roadless inventory. Largely, roadless is placed in back country settings, but some roadless is assigned to a general forest setting that allows timber production. The amount of these different designations will vary. Currently, direction on implementing the 2001 Roadless Rule must be followed and is included in another section of the plan.
36	39	IF	In the second sentence, replace "lumber" with "timber"	Replaced
36	40	RO	Can something more substantial than merely stating production is desired to be a sustainable basis? A very low volume can easily be sustained, but may not be desirable.	The objective places an amount that can be associated with the desired condition.
37	1	EG	Grazing allotments allow off-Forest ranches to stay economically viable, which allows those ranches to continue to provide the bulk of big game winter range for animals residing on the Forest and open space for adjacent communities. Existing grazing leases, including those in IRAs, are maintained to sustain nearby working landscapes .	Section was rewritten
37	1	IDT	The desired condition for grazing doesn't provide the livestock community or other users with a perspective on the future. Given current conditions and expected climate, will the amount and extent of livestock grazing increase during the future?? Will changes in the type of livestock be encouraged, discouraged, or does the agency care? Will the Shoshone have a strong program supporting livestock production as a mechanism to support open space along Forest boundaries?	Section was rewritten

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
37	1	SA	Continue offering commercial livestock grazing permits to support local ranches, economies and communities while helping maintain open space. Livestock grazing creates desired vegetation conditions that support rangeland species and enhance various habitats. Livestock grazing is managed with consideration of other resources and uses and designed to meet or maintain satisfactory rangeland conditions.	Section was rewritten
37	8	EG	Reword text: Lands where past mineral development have occurred have returned to natural conditions to the extent possible that and contribute to supporting multiple-use other resource objectives.	First suggestion was taken; second suggestion is covered by other resource objectives.
38	16	NL	The Draft Plan states, "There are areas where increased public access is a goal..." We recommend the Forest Service specify in which areas there is a focus on increased public access, perhaps in the form of a table or additional map layer.	The plan will not define a specific list. The desired condition indicates the desire to provide public access to the Forest, but accomplishment is totally dependent on opportunity and willing land owners and as such is not realistically definable at this time.
38	18	SF	It is mentioned that funding is not available for road maintenance. Timber sales provide an opportunity for additional road maintenance. If the number of timber sales is increased throughout the suited area, the road maintenance in that area will consequently also increase.	That only works within suited areas, and we have many more miles of road in other areas of the Forest. The plan does not support the position that timber harvest should be promoted to improve road funding. Timber harvest will occur for ecological and economic sustainability reasons.
39	18	FZ EG	It is mentioned in the Plan how some of the special interest groups help clean and improve the trails, but I did not see it is mentioned about how the ORV and snowmobile uses also help contribute to the upkeep of the trails through the fees they pay to use these trails. No partnerships listed with motorized groups such as snowmobile clubs and OHV and trail bike groups?	A range of volunteer groups is now recognized.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
39	22	BK	The Plan should recognize that the use of the state roadways within the Shoshone National Forest by non-motorized traffic, specifically road cyclists, is a valuable and appropriate use.	The state has the responsibility for uses that occur on state highways. The Forest Service does not have jurisdiction.
39	22	DI	I do recommend high maintenance of roads and facilities within travel and recreation corridors. Trailhead facilities within travel corridors be upgraded and maintained. Trail maintenance of existing trails in roadless and wilderness be given recognition in the Plan.	Language on maintenance was added to the desired conditions and objectives.
39	30	WC	Please define "sustainable" in the sentence: "Roads and trails that cross water courses allow for sustainable wildlife corridors, water courses, wetlands, and riparian areas."	Wording was changed
39	33	NL	As terminology surrounding timber harvest (especially within roadless areas) routinely refers to the construction of "temporary roads," the creation of temporary roads should be considered in the Desired Conditions, Objectives, and Guidelines.	Additional wording was added.
39	38	AS	Trails - I would recommend under <i>Desired Conditions</i> , a statement be added to say "there will be no net loss of non-motorized trails." I believe such a statement is critical to insuring pack and saddle stock use at current and/or expanded levels. The present 1300 mile trail system allows for dispersed use and a premier back country experience for many non-motorized users.	Any reductions in trails would be addressed through site-specific NEPA analysis. There may be some situations where adding or reducing trails may be necessary.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
39	38	WC	We were under the impression motorized travel will only be permitted on designated routes after the Forest Service completes its OHV Travel Management Plan. In two places under this desired condition, however, the term “designated routes” is coupled with the phrases “and areas open to motorized use” as well as “in designated areas.” There is no place on the Shoshone that should be turned into a “play area” i.e. a sacrifice zone for motorized vehicles. All motorized travel should be limited to designated routes.	Wording was adjusted to differentiate between wheeled and over-the-snow vehicles.
40	17	IF	I recommend you delete “and natural appearing views and scenery” from paragraph 1 of recreation facilities desired condition.	All campgrounds have been identified as concern level 1 in the scenery management system: views to be maintained as naturally appearing.
40	18	RO	Hazard trees pose a significant danger and liability in developed recreation sites. The mention of user safety in this section may cover this but consider adding a sentence.	Wording adjusted
41	11	RO	Objectives are projections of “outcomes” not “activities.”	Changed
43	7	RO	I don’t find any direction relative to strategy and objective for aquatic systems.	Sections added
43	12	IF	The first objective is time specific, but does not contain any basis for measure either for existing conditions or desirable reduction.	Wording adjusted
43	12	WP	What about direction for the rest of the forest.	Objectives are not included for all possible outcomes. They are selected to highlight the items we believe are most important to reaching desired conditions. The desired conditions provide the direction for the other aspects and outcomes of watershed health.
43	17	IF	The second objective appears to conflict with wilderness desired conditions. “Wilderness area are affected primarily by foresee of nature. Ecological processes ... operate freely from the influences of humans”. I recommend you delete this objective.	The objective supports meeting the wilderness desired condition by addressing problems that need to be corrected in order to meet the desired condition. Problems are related to recreational livestock grazing.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
43	17	NL	Could some information be provided to address the current status of riparian areas, and then in the objective give a sense of what percentage of at-risk or non-functioning riparian areas exist on the forest.	Some additional information was provided.
43	21	JS	Indicate what types of actions the forest would engage in to address air quality.	Language was included on our role in responding to off-Forest impacts.
43	21	WC	When considering whether to lease areas on forest for oil and gas development, consider impacts to Class I and II airsheds.	This is covered by the desired conditions, which require airshed protection.
43	21	WP	All the threats to air quality come from off the forest, yet addressing these impacts is not addressed.	Language was included on our role in responding to off-Forest impacts. Some impacts could occur on the Forest, such as smoke from fire.
43	26	IDT	I would avoid linking your objective for grassland to FRCC. Furthermore, because of the order of the headings, it looks as though the grassland statement is the general strategy for ALL THE ECOSYSTEM diversity, rather than specific to the grassland system.	After further discussion, we decided to drop this direction. It was not dropped because we do not want it to happen; rather we want multiple objectives to be accomplished whenever possible and not just for particular types of opportunities. The headings were adjusted.
43	30	IF	Objectives have an intent of increasing acreage of a particular vegetative cover type. I recommend that you be very clear about the basis for measuring an increase. ie. Relative to the 2007 RIS database or something similar.	A footnote was provided. More information will be in the monitoring plan
43	30	N	Objectives for achieving the desired conditions regarding grasslands are addressed on p. 43, but there are no guidelines. The methods that the Forest Service would like to employ to achieve the stated objectives are of significance to the public. Ideally, a focus on natural processes such as wildfire and simulated natural processes such as controlled burns would be the guidelines of choice.	Guidelines exist for grassland species. Likely activities are displayed in the possible activities appendix. The plan does not prescribe types of specific activities; it describes the outcomes.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
43	Footnote 42	RO	Smoke Sensitivity -- Again for consistency, use definition as stated in the Glossary of Wildfire Terminology per agency direction. FMP reference will address later.	Done
44	3	IDT	I question what you 'buy' through the statement that restoration of sagebrush is coordinated with FRCC. Good work will result in fine accounting. Therefore I would place the emphasis on sage grouse, restoration of forage conditions (understory), and conditions for sagebrush obligates.	Similar to above response
44	7	NL	Objectives for achieving the desired conditions regarding sagebrush are addressed on p. 44, but there are no guidelines. The methods that the Forest Service would like to employ to achieve the stated objectives are of significance to the public. Ideally, a focus on natural processes such as wildfire and simulated natural processes such as controlled burns would be the guidelines of choice.	Guidelines exist for sagebrush species. Likely activities are displayed in the possible activities appendix. The plan does not prescribe types of specific activities; it describes the outcomes.
44	9	SF	The vegetation objectives are a little weak. Is the forest only creating specific objectives for aspen, whitebark pine, and willow.	Objectives are established for those items that are deemed most important to track relative to how close desired conditions are to existing conditions. All desired conditions imply some level of objective if they differ from existing conditions. For the plan, some limited cover types have objectives. There are also objectives for timber volume, acres in fire regime conditions classes, and acres in various fuel conditions.
44	10	GF	We recommend that aspen, willow, and whitebark pine be the 3 highest priority vegetative communities for treatment/management.	Objectives are established for those cover types. Providing specific objectives in the plan establishes a priority higher than for items without objectives. How these objectives compare to other objectives will depend on opportunities, funding levels, and other direction.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
44	20	GF	<p>It is our position that 2,400 acres is too low of an objective for additional aspen acres on the forest. By all conclusions, aspen is much reduced from historic levels, and in many places, is in jeopardy of blinking out entirely from the system. Table 2 (on page 15 of the draft plan) indicates desired condition for aspen between 24,400-73,100 acres. The stated objective of 2,400 additional acres over a 10-15 year period is only ~10% of the low end of that acreage range. In earlier comments, WGFD recommended an objective of at least 4,000 acres in that 10-15 year timeframe. Based on recent discussions, it seems necessary and appropriate that this objective be set much higher than 2,400 acres, probably more in the neighborhood of 5,000 acres (~10% of the mid-point of that range, or ~20% of the low end of that range, depending on how it is stated) of additional aspen in a 10-15 year period. In addition, since ~50% of aspen currently on the SNF occurs on the Washakie RD, with another ~25% on the Wind River RD, it appears to WGFD that aspen on the North Zone of the SNF is least available there, and we feel that some additional emphasis should focus on aspen enhancement in the N Zone of the forest.</p>	<p>We set the objective with an eye toward what we have been able to accomplish in the past and future budget expectations. There is nothing in the plan that prevents us from exceeding the objectives if opportunities present themselves, but we are reluctant to set an objective that we may not be able to deliver. Our analysis indicates that there is a greater potential for aspen on the southern end of the Forest. The objective is set with this in mind. Actual projects will be based on opportunities.</p> <p>This objective is high enough above what we have done that it implies a definite change in emphasis.</p>
44	20	IF	<p>Your proposed desired condition for aspen includes an increase in aspen acreage of as much as 50,000 acres. In light of that desired condition your objective for an increase of 2,400 acres appears timid. I recommend that you also consider opportunities for restore aspen stand using timber harvest on lands suitable for timber harvest.</p>	<p>We do allow for the expansion of aspen on suitable lands, but with the caveat that it be balanced against the need to maintain species for commercial production. Site-specific project analysis is the appropriate place to analyze those tradeoffs.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
44	20	NL	The objectives for acquiring an additional 2,400 acres of aspen cover type should correspond to a guideline, as there are concerns regarding the treatments used to increase aspen on the forest.	Likely activities are displayed in the possible activities appendix. The plan does not prescribe types of specific activities; it describes the outcomes.
44	28	IF	I don't see any reason to limit work on disease resistant Whitebark pine to the 12,000 acres that are accessible and outside roadless areas. I think there are good reasons to consider extending that work to the remainder of the Shoshone NF, including Wilderness areas.	Direction is not meant to restrict work to accessible acres, but rather to acknowledge that much of the work may be restricted to those areas due to logistics and costs. Wording was changed to reflect intent.
44	28	IF	How many acres of disease-resistant whitebark pine are currently present on the Shoshone NF.	Disease-resistant trees have been identified within the Greater Yellowstone Area, including the Shoshone. Seed collected from those trees have been used to grow seedlings that are currently being evaluated for their resistance to disease. In the next few years, it is hoped that this work will yield disease-resistant seedlings that can be planted on the Forest.
44	30	NL	This objective needs a guideline, particularly given the fact that most whitebark is located in Wilderness.	There is already direction on what can occur and not occur in wilderness. No additional plan direction is required.
45	3	GF	As included in Table 6 under aspen, it would be helpful to understand the distribution of existing willow communities on the Forest, to help determine priority areas and opportunities for potential willow enhancement. We recommend a table for willow, similar to Table 6 for aspen. We recommend adding language in Program Strategy to address the following concern: "Willow community enhancement within moose winter range is a high priority".	Because of the diversity of willow communities on the Shoshone, we do not want to assign objectives at the plan level to specific geographic areas. The objectives will remain Forest wide and areas of work will be based on opportunities identified at the project level. We did add focus language in the management approach that included moose habitat.
45	5	IDT	Need a short discussion on coarse woody debris relative to the snag desired conditions.	Information was added

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
45	9	EG	<p>Call habitat connectedness instead of connectivity corridors Add text: Since highways pose the biggest threat to interrupting animal movement patterns, program emphasis will be to coordinate with WDOT when actions to improve highways are proposed. Reword text: Program emphasis for improving elk migration connectivity corridors (migration corridors) should focus on watersheds with low elk security habitat (less than 30 percent).</p>	Some edits were made.
45	9	GF	<p>Connectivity Corridors: Recommend adding an additional objective, Program Strategy to address the following concern: The Forest has no barriers to significant fish and wildlife movements. Exceptions are allowed for those instances when a fish migration barrier is deemed advantageous for needed management or protection of native species.</p>	Some wording added
45	9	SF	<p>Does the program emphasis for connectivity corridors also apply to the 15% of the forest that is manageable? With 85% of the forest being wilderness or roadless, is it necessary to place a connectivity emphasis within the General Forest area?</p>	Yes, that is where the impacts are occurring. The desired condition is generally designed to maintain security at current levels with some improvements made to the lowest security areas. See desired condition.
45	19	IDT	<p>Forest program emphasis is the conservation of the species habitat and collaboration with Wyoming Game and Fish Department (G&F) on species population management. Work with G&F to identify stream segments that are suitable for reintroducing native Yellowstone cutthroat trout (YSC) considering other Forest Service Direction including the Wilderness Act. In areas with genetically pure YSC, work with G&F to consider impacts of stocking non-native fish species.</p>	Recommendations were added

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
45	19	WP	Yellowstone Cutthroat: "In areas of genetically pure YCT, work with G&F to consider impacts before stocking non-natives" Here again a display of great leadership. Why would the Shoshone allow stocking of non-natives over YCT whether pure or not? This section fails to even mention the most critical issue - habitat conditions or how to protect or restore habitat conditions.	Management of populations is the responsibility of the Game and Fish Department. That is why the language is written as it is. Habitat conditions are addressed under desired conditions. Given that conditions are not a major limiting factor on the Shoshone, it is not a focus in this section. That does not mean it is not important.
45	30	IDT	Within 10 years, enhance or restore about 20 miles of Yellowstone cutthroat stream habitat. This would be accomplished through various management practices including stream habitat improvement structures, improved fish passage at road crossings, watershed improvement projects, improved grazing practices, improved road drainage, and enhanced security of the genetic integrity of pure fish populations.	We chose to use stream segments rather than miles. Some of the rest of the items belong in the possible actions appendix. Plan components will not describe how, just the outcome.
45	35	IDT	Despite the limited knowledge regarding the butterflies, do you know the primary nectar plants. Can you avoid trampling or other activities that might remove these plants from a meadow system??	There is direction in guidelines.
46	3	RO	Maybe I'm just lost in the way this plan is organized, but I expected to see some plant SOI mentioned in this section.	There are no objectives for plant species of interest, so there is no information in this section.
46	11	SF IDT	The third sentence, "...efforts should be focused on areas with know populations..." Replace with "known."	Done
46	18	NL	The Forest Service should demonstrate a need for introducing nonnative trout species into habitat where they do not currently exist.	Management of populations is the responsibility of the Game and Fish Department. We work with them on such proposals. The focus of this statement was changed from non-natives to any fish stocking.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
46	22	EG	Add text: In riparian areas, habitats should contain a natural mix of vegetation. Within grazing allotments the condition class should generally be good or better, measured at the 4 th code hydrologic unit, and recognizing the variability created by floods, fires, and insect outbreaks. Road crossings should be designed to facilitate fish passage.	Similar direction was added in the riparian section under ecosystem diversity.
46	22	GF	Riparian Group: The objective listed under the riparian group heading is too vague, and should include a specific acreage for improving riparian vegetation.	Some changes were made to the text. We do not want an acres-driven objective. The project level is most appropriate for identifying what needs to be done. Some quantitative description was added.
46	26	EG	Add for elk -- In the transition between summer range and winter range (often at or near the forest boundary), open road densities should generally be no more than 1 mile/square mile. Opportunities for designating OHV opportunities and snowmobile routes within winter ranges will be closely coordinated with WGFD.	This first item is reflected in the desired condition described earlier. That measure is used rather than road density. Any new routes will be addressed through the NEPA process with associated dialog with the Game and Fish Department
46	35	EG	Connectivity corridors for sheep haven't been defined, so delete unless SNF can delineate. Domestic sheep grazing is not allowed in bighorn sheep habitat. Vacant allotments in non-bighorn sheep habitat will be given priority for domestic sheep grazing requests. Within 5 years, recreational and outfitted pack goat grazing will be eliminated within bighorn sheep habitat. Areas not having bighorn sheep habitat will remain open to outfitted and recreational pack goat use.	A corridor is known for the Whiskey Mountain herd. Some of this information is addressed under guidelines. The existing direction on sheep grazing (grizzly bear amendment) restricts sheep allotments to Washakie Ranger District, which is outside the core bighorn sheep range. The plan will not provide direction on what priority will be given to any vacant allotments. That will be handled at the project level. The plan designates those allotments as generally suitable for grazing. Direction is included on the disease concern. There is still some level of uncertainty with goat and bighorn sheep disease transmission. The plan direction employs a cautious approach while additional study is completed.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
46	39	GF	We recommend that existing or potential noxious weed invasions on crucial big game winter ranges be adequately controlled. The Invasive Species section should list or describe those species the Forest is concerned about. As the plan reads now, it's hard to know which invasive plants are being addressed. A strategy to help attain that objective would be careful management of all off-road, wheeled, motorized travel, to prevent the spread of invasive plant species. This effort needs to be coordinated and reconciled with the recreation strategy on Page 48 calling for the addition of three motorized loop trails.	The desired condition targets some specific species, but most specifics are dealt with at the program management stage during the development of annual programs of work. We do not believe eliminating uses is the best way to address these issues. Big game winter range is mentioned in the management approach.
46	39	RO	At the time of National Fire Plan, the Forest was submitting for funding significant backlog rehab projects that dealt with invasive species in old burns. Would this continue be a key element here worth noting for the future?	Not a significant issue on the Shoshone. Wording was added to the background section to acknowledge impacts.
46	39	WC	Please be more specific regarding ways in which the Forest Service will "restrict" new infestations. In a recent EA for the Purdy Fire Salvage Project, the Forest Service acknowledged that vehicles and livestock are the two most common means by which invasive plants spread on the forest. It would follow then, that the Forest Service's strategy should include mention of the desire to limit the number of new roads, whether temporary or permanent and restrict grazing in areas not yet experiencing exotic plant infestations.	The paragraph as it continues indicates what will be done. By reducing and eliminating sources, we reduce the potential for spread, whether from roads, trails, grazing, or other uses. We believe we can stay ahead and make progress on this issue without eliminating uses.
47	1	NL	Rangeland "resting," especially in tall forb & grassland communities, should be considered as a program element.	We have only one tall forb grassland on the Forest in an area that is not grazed. This is not a practice we use to manage weeds. Management practices are designed so that livestock grazing maintains range condition across the Forest.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
47	3	IDT	Forest uses integrated pest management techniques to limit or control the spread of invasive species.	Added
47	9	MC	Would it be appropriate to include work cooperatively with the Wyoming Weed and Pest	Wording changed.
47	14	IDT	It seems the description of the program earlier in the document, and our earlier discussions, suggested a more vigorous program. The Objective doesn't mention any populations being eliminated. Are there no areas where you feel you can achieve eradication in 15 years?	There is some discussion in desired conditions on elimination of some populations. But because of the difficulty, the objectives do not include such language.
47	14	IDT	To prevent the spread of aquatic nuisance species ensure that all construction, fire suppression equipment and waders containing mud and sediments are thoroughly rinsed and cleaned (preferably with warm water). This includes before entering the Forest and on-site after the work is completed. No untreated water from other sources should be transported on or off the Forest. All equipment containing untreated water should be drained and cleaned on site at the source before leaving the Forest.	Added a guideline for administrative activity
47	27	NL	In regards to prescribed fire and wildland fire, objectives should be explicit in addressing management decisions that will be considered when a class 2 fire regime condition overlaps land suitable for timber production.	Fire regime/condition class describes stand and fuel structure. That structure could be achieved with fire, mechanical treatments, or a combination of the two. Those decisions will be made at the project level. Other benefits and tradeoffs from fire vs. mechanical will also be addressed at the project level. The plan is looking at the broader fire regime/condition class on the landscape conditions.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
47	36	RO	This paragraph needs to be re-written to align with whatever edits are made to the paragraph referenced earlier on page 11. This paragraph is confusing in terms of articulating the priorities. Probably stating that “property and natural and cultural resources are low priority” is not real sensitive when we imply something different to the reader on pages 11 and 30. I would also question the use of the word “goal” when addressing life and property.	Wording changed
48	15	RO	There really is no existing definition or number of national average related to fire costs which makes this an objective that really cannot be attained. The best replacement for this bullet is the last sentence in the first paragraph on this page. I am not sure I would leave the “10-15 year statement in either since 5 years is a pretty good spread.	There is already national direction to address the situation. Given the continuing changes that are occurring in how to respond to and measure this item, we decided to drop the objective.
48	27	NL	In the Desired Conditions component of this topic, a diverse range of motorized and non-motorized recreation experiences are addressed. Yet, it appears that motorized recreation is the only use the forest service feels is underrepresented, as this is the only use addressed in the objectives. Objectives for alternative recreation experiences should also be addressed.	The objective is in the roads and trails section now. The lack of non-motorized activities was not identified as a concern. There was a concern about where opportunities are available but that is a different type of issue that is being addressed through the recreation settings.
48	28	AS	I would recommend under <i>Objectives - plan component</i> an objective be added to increase the number of horse camps by at least three - specifically the Majo site on the South Fork, Wolf Creek on the Dunior, and Bonneville at Brooks Lake. Three horse camps would provide some equality with the motorized trail loop development which is proposed throughout the forest.	After some discussion we decided that this is not an area we want an objective for. That does not mean we won't consider developing horse camps, but we don't feel this rises to the level of needing to be emphasized in the plan. The plan allows for this type of development and it will be considered at the project level.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
48	28	BF	I concerned about the motorized trail objective and the impact on roadless and potential wilderness. Care must be taken in there placement.	The plan will not authorize specific trail locations. Project analysis will still need to occur to determine where such a trail is appropriate. Any location will have to be consistent with the other direction in the plan.
48	29	WC	We are concerned with the statement: "Within 10-15 years, three additional motorized trail loop opportunities are available." We expressed reservations in our last round of comments about the desired condition for "high quality motorized loop routes." We incorporate those comments by reference. Here again it seems the Forest Service is putting the cart before the horse. It has yet to delineate the existing trails that should remain open, let alone which areas may be appropriate for new loop trails. This will occur, we were told, in the OHV Travel Management Process, which will be coupled with an EIS. Perhaps travel planning should occur simultaneously with forest planning if specific objectives such as "three new trails" are being mentioned in the forest plan.	This objective is no different from an objective to cut so many board feet a year, or increase the acres of a certain cover type. It is not a commitment to a specific action. It is expressed as a desire to develop an opportunity. Specifics will be addressed through project planning.
48	31	EG	Add text: Manage all developed sites to standard.	Managing developed sites to standard was incorporated into the management approach for recreation facilities.
49	32	EG	Reword text: Stewardship contracts and other methods may be particularly appropriate on for restoration treatments from other all suitable lands where products values may make it more difficult to use traditional timber methods including timber can be removed.	Reworded paragraph
49	32	NL	More details on "Stewardship Contracts" and what these may entail would be beneficial.	Added definition to glossary.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
49	32	WC	What analysis will the Forest Service undertake to reach its acreage figures for lands suitable for timber harvest and production? Is there an analysis or evaluation in the plan set of documents? If so, please let us know where to reference this. We urge the Forest Service to make sure inventoried roadless areas are found to be unsuitable for timber production and only suitable for timber harvest if an area meets one of the criteria in the 2001 Roadless Rule.	Documentation on timber suitability is available in the plan set of documents. Suitable uses indicates that timber production is not suitable in back country areas. The plan looks at broader issues than whether the area is within the roadless inventory. Largely, roadless is placed in back country settings, but some roadless is assigned to a general forest setting that allows timber production. The amount of these different designations will vary. Currently, direction on implementing the 2001 Roadless Rule must be followed and is included in another section of the plan.
50	3	GF	This objective should be re-written to state: 'For the next 10 to 15 years, commercial livestock grazing will continue in existing allotments commensurate with current permitted use and available forage, so long as vegetative communities are not adversely impacted, as determined through allotment monitoring. Additionally, the objective/strategy should allow for willing permittees to take longer terms of voluntary non-use without jeopardy of losing their grazing permits, and the objective/strategy should facilitate the development and use of forage reserve areas (i.e., grassbanks).	Grazing discussions were changed. The qualifier on the grazing for reducing impacts is not added to the objectives. Between the desired condition and guidelines for winter range, we believe the intent is covered. Non-use guidance is not suitable for plan direction. That is part of permit administration guidance. Grassbanks are available under the guideline that maintains allotments for commercial grazing.
50	6	EG	Extensive suggestions on additions to the range discussion here.	Input was considered during the rewrite of the section.
50	6	IDT	In order to produce a plan that holds together and can be evaluated as a unit, I suggest more specifics for grazing objectives - range condition changes, riparian conditions, infrastructure, etc.**	Section was rewritten

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
50	6	RO	There is only one 'grazing' objective stated. This is pretty weak and kind of raises a red flag. In addition, use of the word 'grazing' when what is meant is 'livestock grazing' is incorrect.	Section was rewritten
50	6	SA	Change 10 to 15 year language to life of the plan.	Wording changes made similar to other objectives.
50	11	RO	The program strategy should include some reference to vegetation management planning for special use sites, power lines, etc. Michele O'Connell in RO has the lead for developing Regional direction in this area.	Some wording was added
50	13	EG	Add text: Manage all Special Use authorizations to standard. Consider increased allocations for Day Use Outfitter and Guide authorizations for non-traditional, but increasing recreation uses such as mountain biking, ice climbing, hiking, snowmobiling, These type (non-traditional) of authorizations can be relatively easy to accommodate, usually have minor to no resource impacts, and are relatively inexpensive to process due to the Special Use cost recovery policy.	Language was added to address to standard. Direction covers the ability to do day use authorizations.
50	19	RO	No minerals program strategy or objectives.	Added minerals sections in chapters 1, 2, 3, and 5
50	37	NL	An explanation of the term "sixth level hydrologic unit boundary" should be included in the Land Management Plan.	Added to glossary
51	9	WC	"For each year in the next 10 to 15 years, the total miles of National Forest System roads does not exceed by more than 10 miles the total miles at the time of Plan approval." Does this mean that it would be acceptable to add 9.9 miles of system roads each year for the next 10-15 years? This is unclear as is footnote 47.	Wording was adjusted

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
51	11	IF	I strongly support the concept of carrying forward surplus obliteration miles from the previous forest plan. Other than documenting that intent, I don't see any reason to keep this objective. There is no reason to constrain us of the surplus obliteration to any particular year or period of time.	This objective is designed to continue the no net gain policy with an objective of not increasing the road system.
51	13	GF WC	Roads and trails: The existing statement regarding "20 routes" is too vague and there is no statement of cumulative length of those 20 routes. Additionally, there should be an objective emphasizing enforcement of off-road travel restrictions to prevent the establishment and use of new, unauthorized routes. An objective statement may be: "The miles of unauthorized, motorized routes will be reduced by 50% over the next 10 to 15 years." "Within 10 to 15 years, use and associated ground disturbance have stopped on 20 unauthorized routes." How did the Forest Service arrive at 20 as a number? This seems to be setting the bar quite low, especially given the effort that will be put into the OHV travel management plan, whose goal is to end unauthorized travel and the accompanying destruction it causes. By 2009, all forest units are to have a map that will delineate permissible routes for motorized vehicles. Unauthorized use on closed trails will decrease only if the Forest Service makes enforcement in these areas a priority. We suggest adding an objective that puts a certain number of law enforcement officers on the ground in each district.	Number of routes was increased to 50. The percent reduction in unauthorized routes would require base inventory of unauthorized routes, which does not exist. Language on how to deal with unauthorized use is addressed in possible action appendix.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
51	15	AS EG	Under <i>Objectives - plan component</i> I would like to see a mileage number for System trails under the deferred maintenance objective. Add number.	Mileage added
51	16	IF	I agree with the concept of reducing deferred road maintenance needs, but recommend that you measure the reduction by a percentage of total needs instead of “declined on 10 miles”. For clarification, is “deferred road maintenance needs” the same as the “road maintenance backlog”. If so, I support your new terminology.	Due to changes in databases and systems, the base changes, making it difficult to work with percentages.
51	16	NL	The objectives for road construction and maintenance should have a corresponding guideline component addressing erosion, habitat preservation, and species of concern/interest.	Guidelines for road construction and maintenance are included under watershed and wildlife and are represented by use of the Watershed Conservation Practices handbook
51	27	GF	Recommend adding language in a Program Strategy to address the following concern. Through land exchange or acquisition, private in-holdings (within the Forest boundary) that are designated as important wildlife areas (e.g., crucial winter range) are acquired by the USFS, to eliminate possible future development of those lands.	Incorporated wildlife habitat into the management approach
52	7	RO	The species diversity and recreation experiences discussion read almost like “exceptions” to table 8. For readability, put this discussion after the table, or consider using these as footnotes to the table.	Section was changed
52	8	RO	Again, I was expecting SOI plants to be addressed here somewhere.	There are no objectives, so they are not here. The desired condition sets the direction that is needed.
52	10	IDT	Using goats to control noxious weeds is generally suitable outside bighorn sheep core range.	Guideline is added on use of goats, though this is not a practice that we currently use.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
52	11	GF	We are very concerned over the statement: “Over-the-snow motorized vehicle use is generally suitable on designated routes or in designated areas within bighorn sheep winter range.” As discussed in the 3/5/07 videoconference, we strongly feel that motorized use, including over-the-snow vehicles, should be minimized on crucial big game winter ranges (including elk, moose, bighorn sheep, and mountain goat). There needs to be clarifying language in the draft forest plan that clears up the confusing language currently in place. Possible language: “Over-the-snow motorized vehicle use is only suitable on specially designated routes or specially designated areas within crucial big game winter range”. This tells a reader and user of the plan that bighorn sheep (and other big game) winter ranges are not suitable for over-the-snow motorized vehicle use unless specially designated routes or areas are determined suitable (as recommended by WGFD and USFS). Otherwise, this “generally suitable” language tends to indicate that there are designated routes and designated areas in all winter ranges.	Direction on motorized use in winter range is covered under that heading now. This species-specific direction was dropped.
52	11	NL	Snowmobiles should not be considered “generally suitable” within bighorn sheep winter range. Rather, they should be considered “generally unsuitable except on designated routes within bighorn sheep winter range.”	Direction on motorized use in winter range is covered under that heading now. This species-specific direction was dropped.
52	11	RO	Put the bighorn sheep suitable use after the table. It confused me until I read the table. Move bighorn sheep to after Table 8	Direction dropped from here

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
52	11	WC	“Over-the-snow motorized vehicle use is generally suitable on designated routes or in designated areas within bighorn sheep winter range.” Please change this to read that over-the-snow vehicle use is not suitable within bighorn sheep winter range. What restrictions apply to winter range if not some limits on winter recreation? The “designated areas” suitable for over-the-snow vehicles should be those that are not wilderness, not the Dunoir SMU and not winter range. The plan should also reflect that domestic sheep grazing is not suitable in areas identified as bighorn sheep habitat.	Direction as been clarified for motorized use in winter range. Direction on sheep in bighorn habitat is included in the plan.
52	16	RH	Include a sentence on: non-motorized over-snow uses such as skiing, snowboarding, and snowshoeing, sport rock climbing, hunting and fishing, and other recreational pursuits that are enjoyed by the public.	The section was reworked, removing types of activities, though some specific activities are addressed. A general list of activities is included in the background section in chapter 1. We wanted to avoid the implication that a use is generally not suitable if it was not included in the list under suitable uses. All non-motorized activities are lumped together, unless there is specific plan direction for a particular activity.
52	19	BK	The Dunoir Special Management Area should continue to allow mountain bike access. The plan is unclear as to whether mountain bikes would be allowed continued access to this area. The High Lakes wilderness study area should continue to allow mountain bike access. The plan is unclear as to whether mountain bikes would be allowed continued access to this area. Continued mountain bike access does not diminish an areas wilderness characteristics.	Current interpretation is that bikes are not allowed under the law within Dunoir Special Management Area. The Forest Leadership Team will consider the High Lakes WSA mountain bikes comment. It will be examined going forward.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
52	24	EG	<p>Reword text: Over-the-snow winter motorized use is generally suitable within and outside the Dunoir Special Management Unit, outside designated wilderness, and as shown in Table 8.</p> <p>The 1986 Forest Plan allowed snowmobiling in the Dunoir Special Management Area, so what has changed to disallow it now?</p>	<p>The 1986 Forest Plan allowed snowmobiling in the DuNoir, though there was some conflicting discussion in some portions of the Plan. As part of plan revision, we received internal advice that the direction in the 1986 Plan was in conflict with the DuNoir legislation. Our interpretation is that the legislation does not support allowing snowmobiling in Dunoir. We do not have the rationale for the interpretation that was made for the 1986 Plan, so we cannot assess why a different conclusion was made at that time.</p>
53	Column 1	EG	<p>Add following to blank cells under “Timber production on lands suitable for timber production”</p> <p>Generally unsuitable except where needed to facilitate prescribed burning or wildland fire use</p>	<p>The way we have defined backcountry, it is not suitable for timber production, though timber harvest can be used for meeting other resource objectives. Timber production is not necessary to facilitate prescribed burning or wildland fire use. Timber harvest would allow for any necessary timber cutting.</p>
53	Column 1	MC	<p>Back country non-motorized, back country winter motorized, and back country summer motorized use settings should be classed as “generally suitable for timber production” on those lands suitable for timber production. (Table 8, and as discussed in the narrative.)</p>	<p>Our determination is that permanent roads are needed to manage for timber production, and by definition, these areas will not have permanent roads.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
53	Column 7	GF NL	<p>Table 8. Suitable uses by setting. Over-the-snow winter motorized use is listed as “generally suitable” in back-country winter motorized areas. We would concur, only to the point where snowmachine use does not impact ungulate distribution or use of crucial winter ranges. Surface occupancy associated with leasable mineral development is considered “generally suitable” under Option 3. In this case, we support Option 1, where that activity would not be considered generally suitable. In Table 8, it would seem appropriate to list wildlife winter range in a separate column, to avoid any contradictions that may result from a use that is deemed suitable in general forest settings, but is not suitable in big game winter ranges.</p> <p>Table 8 lays out the similarities between a “General forest” suitable use and a “General forest and wildlife winter range” suitable use, and the lack of protection for winter range is cause for concern. Wildlife winter range should more closely resemble the suitable uses for “Back country summer motorized” or “Back country non-motorized.” Timber production does not seem to be a suitable use within wildlife winter range, nor is snowmobiling, nor is surface-occupied mineral development.</p>	<p>Specific guidelines were added for winter range.</p> <p>Restrictions on mineral activity in winter range are based on the 1995 Oil and Gas decision, which is being carried forward into the revised plan. Timber production can be compatible with winter range, though generally the two do not overlap since winter range tends to be open rather than forested.</p>
53	Column 7	HS	<p>Timbering should be allowed and encouraged in the roadless areas, utilizing temporary or non-public roads that may be used for management purposes.</p>	<p>All roadless areas are suitable for harvest for other resource purposes. By definition, these areas will not have permanent roads. Temporary roads are allowed. Roadless areas where timber production is a desired use are assigned to a general forest setting. The 2001 Roadless Conservation Rule currently applies in addition to any plan direction.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
53	Table 8	CC	The existing MOU between the State of Wyoming and the SNF states “No additional oil and gas and mineral lease will be approved within inventoried roadless areas on the Bridger-Teton and Shoshone national forest Land until such time as the oil and gas availability decision are made. Until availability decisions are made, the stipulations in the MOUs Must be part of the Forest Plan.	Direction has been added.
53	Table 8	GF	Over-the-snow winter motorized use is listed as “generally suitable” in back-country winter motorized areas. We would concur, only to the point where snowmachine use does not impact ungulate distribution or use of crucial winter ranges. Surface occupancy associated with leasable mineral development is considered “generally suitable” under Option 3. In this case, we support Option 1, where that activity would not be considered generally suitable. In Table 8, it would seem appropriate to list wildlife winter range in a separate column, to avoid any contradictions that may result from a use that is deemed suitable in general forest settings, but is not suitable in big game winter ranges.	Presentation was reworked. Winter range direction is now provided separately, mostly in chapter 5.
53	Table 8	NL	Table 8 lays out the similarities between a “General forest” suitable use and a “General forest and wildlife winter range” suitable use, and the lack of protection for winter range is cause for concern. Wildlife winter range should more closely resemble the suitable uses for “Back country summer motorized” or “Back country non-motorized.” Timber production does not seem to be a suitable use within wildlife winter range, nor is snowmobiling, nor is surface-occupied mineral development.	Presentation was changed. Winter range guidance is found in chapter 5. Timber production use is compatible with winter range, which is the same as under the current Forest Plan. Mineral development direction is based on the 1995 oil and gas decision, which includes specific direction to follow in winter range.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
53	Table 8	NL	Table 8 is confusing along the “Surface occupancy associated with leasable mineral development” row, in that the setting changes across the options. It seems that a suitable use would be consistent across the options, and only the boundaries for these suitable uses would change. As stated above, <i>general forest and wildlife winter range</i> should not be a setting that is considered “generally suitable” for surface occupancy. Otherwise, option 1 provides the most sound level of use with each associated setting.	Presentation was changed. See above response.
53	Table 8	RO	The suitability table 8 shows suitability by “setting”, but these need to be defined. Also, because the rule requires a relationship established in the plan between desired conditions and suitable uses, there needs to be “hook” in the desired conditions narrative explaining the differences between settings.	Cross reference was added
53	Table 8	RO	Provide a reference to where these options are identified. Briefly explain these options somewhere.	Section was reworked
55	Column 1	NL	Table 9 contains acres of timber production compatible (and incompatible) with desired conditions and objectives across the options. These numbers deserve some explanation. Are they a combination of <i>general forest</i> acres and <i>general forest winter range</i> acres?	See timber suitability analysis for more information. The way the settings are defined, timber production is associated with the general forest setting. If the desired conditions were to have any area suitable for timber production, the area was assigned a general forest setting. Winter range is now assigned separately since direction applies to all winter range regardless of what setting they are in. The way we initially tried to portray this was too confusing, so we are now assigning settings and winter range designations and associated plan direction separately.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
55	Column 1	WC	Please explain the category “Timber production incompatible with desired conditions and objectives.” Why are the acreage figures in this column under all options much larger than the acreage figures in the column entitled, “Timber production compatible with desired conditions and objectives?” How were these figures derived?	See documentation in timber suitability analysis.
55	3	NL	The line between timber harvest and timber production is vague. A deeper discussion of “vegetation treatments” and “fuel reductions” that addresses concerns about impacts to the ground, erosion, and habitat would be beneficial.	Guidelines that address implementation of vegetation objectives are addressed in the watershed and wildlife sections. Types of activities are listed in the possible activities appendix.
55	4	WC	We recognize that the areas deemed suitable for either timber production or timber harvest have yet to be decided. We urge the Forest Service to find that inventoried roadless areas (those surveyed in RARE II and the additional acreage mapped in 2006) are not suitable for timber production. Of these inventoried roadless areas, please also find that they may be suitable for timber harvest only if they meet one of the criteria in the 2001 Roadless Rule.	Most timber production land is designated outside roadless. Roadless areas where the plan designates timber production are not assigned a back country setting. Timber harvest is generally suitable in back country areas, except the 2001 Roadless Rule is applied to RARE II acres. The plan also applies restrictions on road building in back country areas, which encompass a large portion of the roadless areas.
55	17	GF	We recommend that the statement “Commercial livestock grazing is generally suitable in areas shown on Map 13” be changed to “Commercial cattle grazing is generally suitable in areas shown on Map 13”. This addresses the issue of potential contact between wild sheep and domestic sheep/goats.	Wording not changed. Direction on sheep and goats is included in other sections.
55	17	MC	Under grazing suitable uses plan component would like to see more discussion.	Added some wording and cross-referencing to other sections.
55	61	EG	Both non-forested and forested areas are suitable and capable of providing forage for herbivory by domestic livestock and wild ungulates.	Did not change. Existing language provides direction needed.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
56	3	AS	Plan needs to address MOU for leasing in roadless areas.	Direction added.
56	8	GF NL	Minerals, Locatable: We disagree with the statement "Locatable mineral development is generally suitable ...outside of areas that have been withdrawn from minerals development." In our 5/19/06 letter, we recommended, "crucial big game winter ranges should be removed from locatable mineral leasing"; we stand by that earlier recommendation. "Backcountry non-motorized," "backcountry winter motorized," "recommended wilderness," and "winter range" should be included in the list of areas that are not suitable for surface occupancy, or at least with stringent stipulations that preserve the natural character of the area.	We understand the requests for changes in the oil and gas leasing and associated stipulations direction. In the need for change discussion, the decision maker decided to pull forward the 1995 oil and gas leasing decision and not reanalyze that decision in the plan revision. Any decision to modify the 1995 decision will be made after the revision process is complete
56	10	RO	There is a general inconsistency in this section between the text and footnotes as it applies to acquired lands where hard rock minerals are leasable. Also need to address mineral materials	Section was reworked.
56	28	BD	Big game crucial winter ranges and lands within 3 miles of sage grouse leks should be off-limits to all oil and gas activity; studies are making it increasingly plain that activities during both the drilling and production phases of field development drive big game away from preferred ranges and onto areas that may be marginal for sustaining these animals through the winter.	The 1995 Oil and Gas Lasing Record of Decision includes direction for big game winter range. There are no identified sage grouse leks on the Forest.
56	28	GF	We further recommend the list of bulleted points on page 56 be modified to state: "Surface occupancy associated with leasable mineral development is generally suitable on the Forest outside the following areas: Mountain goat areas Crucial big game winter ranges and mapped parturition areas	Your comments are noted. We are carrying forward the 1995 Oil and Gas Lasing Record of Decision. Changes such as you recommend will be addressed in subsequent project level NEPA analysis.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
56	28	WC	<p>Please provide a link on the forest planning website where the public can access the 1996 Oil and Gas Leasing Record of Decision or summarize in the plan the areas that the 1996 Decision identified as suitable. Will the Shoshone National Forest update its availability decision after the forest plan is adopted? We would support this approach as it has been more than ten years since that decision was finalized.</p> <p>Much has changed on Wyoming's landscape with respect to oil and gas development and much has changed in the minds of the public. Many people are concerned that with the rampant development on surrounding BLM lands, the National Forest lands should be cautiously developed, if at all, taking into consideration new and significant changes on surrounding lands. An updated analysis and an opportunity for the public to participate in helping to shape the future of the Shoshone National Forest is appropriate given these changes.</p> <p>Please describe how far away surface occupancy would be allowed near all the areas listed without a mileage indicator. For example, would surface occupancy be allowed 1/4 mile or 1/2 mile (or more) away from grizzly bear moth feeding sites?</p> <p><i>Bald eagle and peregrine nesting sites:</i> The allowable distance from these sites appears as 1/4 mile on page 56 and 1/2 mile on page 76 of the plan. Given the scoping comments the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service submitted on a proposed exploratory wells project on the Bridger-Teton NF, we recommend this be changed to at least 1 mile if disturbance is in open country and 2.5 miles for activities such as construction, seismic exploration, blasting and timber harvest. See USFWS February 13, 2006 letter at 3. (Attachment 1).</p> <p><i>Inventoried roadless areas:</i> The state of Wyoming entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in March, 2006. It states, "Suitability of lands for oil and gas leasing will be evaluated during the forest plan revision process. Subsequent leasing availability decisions will</p>	<p>We understand the requests for changes in the oil and gas leasing and associated stipulations direction. In the need for change discussion, the decision maker decided to pull forward the 1995 Oil and Gas Lasing Record of Decision and not reanalyze that decision in the plan revision. Any decision to modify the 1995 decision will be made after the revision process is complete</p> <p>Direction from the 1995 Oil and Gas Lasing Record of Decision is included in a plan appendix.</p> <p>Direction is added to address the MOU direction.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
			<p>identify specific areas in the suitable land use areas where leasing may occur and the specific stipulations that apply on those acres. No additional oil and gas and mineral leases will be approved within inventoried roadless areas on Bridger-Teton and Shoshone National Forest land until such time as the oil and gas availability decisions are made.”</p> <p>This MOU elevated the status of inventoried roadless areas in the forest planning process. The governor has often explained that although he is not a supporter of any national roadless rule, he does think locally crafted solutions have the potential to protect special landscapes in Wyoming. This MOU was a message to the public that the state and the forests believed roadless areas should be treated differently in the planning process and decisions about future management with respect to oil and gas development should occur in a careful and cautious manner. Unfortunately, the draft plan does not reflect that roadless areas were given any special consideration with respect to oil and gas suitability determinations. We had advocated in prior comments that all roadless areas should be deemed unsuitable for oil and gas development. Short of that we would like the Forest Service to decide that a portion of the IRAs are unsuitable, particularly the ones that received high ratings under the capability, availability and need categories for wilderness evaluation. Some of these areas will not be recommended for wilderness, but they could certainly be justified as unsuitable for industrialization due to their high-quality backcountry characteristics. We encourage the Forest Service to consider the spirit in which the MOU was entered into and to reconsider its suitability determinations with respect to oil and gas development in IRAs.</p>	

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
57	14	EG	Suitability statement should apply to general forest areas as well.	Comment was about this statement: New campground development is generally suitable within the travel and recreation corridor setting. The statement was modified based on the comment and was changed from campgrounds to recreation facilities so that other facilities are covered.
57	15	AS	Change the wording to read "New campground and horse camp development is generally suitable within the travel and recreation corridor setting."	Wording adjusted to included all facilities.
58	8	GF	Recommended Wilderness: We strongly support Option 2 (1 new wilderness area, Dunoir). We request further discussion with the Forest Service concerning Option 1 (recommendation of 6 new wilderness areas (High Lakes, Dunoir, Dunoir additions, Trout Creek, Francs Peak, and Wood River). Additionally, we support specific language that would allow certain activities within the recommended wilderness area, for the benefit of wildlife/wildlife habitat. Examples of specific language are found in the Glacier Addition to the Fitzpatrick Wilderness.	Future options for recommended wilderness will be discussed as we move forward. At this point, we do not anticipate many situations like the Glacier Addition.
58	15	EG	Other direction The Wyoming Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law, 98-550)	Portions of the Wyoming Wilderness Act that provide direction are included in special areas. The Act will be part of the Plan Set of Documents.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
58	17	EG	<p>Program strategy Those areas administratively recommended for wilderness or wilderness study area are not available for any use or activity that may reduce their wilderness potential. Forest lands not recommended for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System are released for multiple use management.</p> <p>There are approximately 102,000 acres of “roadless” land identified in the 2006 inventory that were not identified in the 1979 RARE II inventory. The plan must provide direction and clarification on how those lands will be managed. The SNF has stated to the SCAC that these lands will not be subject to the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. Please include language to that effect in the Plan (see later comment under RARE II areas).</p>	<p>Management of recommended wilderness to maintain wilderness potential was added.</p> <p>The second point, management for lands not recommended, is described elsewhere in the plan with referenced maps. New inventory areas are assigned to a range of settings.</p> <p>Third point, direction from 2001 Roadless Rule, will be specifically tied to the 1979 RAREII inventory as shown in the 2001 Roadless Rule.</p>
59	9	EG	Is this being interpreted to include snowmobile use?	Yes
59	18	RO	Direction is to stick with traditional categories within the special uses section.	RARE II area direction was moved to appendix.
59	27	IF	Given the state of flux for roadless regulations and direction, I recommend you delete the paragraph starting with the “2001 roadless conservation rule”.	The direction applies, so it needs to be addressed in the plan. It is addressed in such a manner that the direction will apply only if the 2001 Roadless Conservation Rule is in effect.
59	31	RO	Do you want 2001 rule direction to remain if rule goes away.	The plan provides information on what direction will apply in the absence of the 2001 Roadless Rule.
59	32	EG	Suggest wording changes to 2001 roadless section.	Specific wording was left as it is in the 2001 Roadless Rule. Direction in chapter 3 states that 2001 Roadless Rule direction applies only to RARE II areas.
60	7	WP	IRA’s “road construction ... is generally suitable” in IRA’s for “cutting, sale, and removal of timber” “for personal or administrative use” Where did this come from?	Outlining in this section was incorrect. It has been changed to match 2001 Roadless Rule language. Direction is now in an appendix.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
60	32	AS EG	Change wording from horse packers to saddle and pack stock users. "Stock" is more encompassing as we assume the Forest also sees llama, alpaca, etc., users?	Changed to pack and saddle stock users.
62	3	WP	Wilderness Suitable Uses: Open to any timber harvest, motorized use? This section needs to be clarified.	The component was reworded to reflect language in the law.
63	11	RO	I don't think the RNA program is supposed to always be the rare geologic, ecologic and vegetation communities. They are supposed to be a representative sample I do believe.	Reworded
63	15	RO	Research Natural Areas outside wilderness are open to mining claims. I must assume mineral development is generally suitable in these areas.	Added direction on proposed areas into suitable uses
67	4	DI	With the vision of the continental divide trail to be a non-motorized, pack and saddle stock and hiking trail. Every effort should be made to make the trail non-motorized. Winter motorized is not a conflict in most areas of the Forest.	The current situation is addressed in the direction and discussion. No timetable in the plan is set for meeting the non-motorized desired condition.
68	26	NL	Protect should be replaced with protect and improve.	Change not made. It is not always possible to improve when the purpose of the project is for a resource other than soil and water. In those cases, protect is what we want.
68	33	EG	Natural events (i.e. 1988 Yellowstone fires) suggest a HUC5 better approximates the size at which large events define forest patterns	We would agree that HUC5 is a better scale for addressing large events. Our goal in selecting HUC6 for most of our direction is to tie both to the 1986 Forest Plan and to the level that we plan projects. None of our active management is designed to replicate the large-scale events as portrayed by the 1988 fires. On the portion of the Forest we actively manage, we have stepped it down to the HUC6 scale. This seems suitable since not all disturbance events occur at the HUC5 scale and the fact that a large portion of the Forest will be governed by natural events.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
68	33	IDT	While I like the concept of having age described for old growth, in order to show we are meeting this requires a very large time and money investment to obtain age data over an analysis area. We normally do not have a lot of extra funds to perform intensive stand exam over an entire watershed, much less even for the areas we are treating within that watershed.	This does not require a 100% sample to make a reasoned decision that the direction is being met. This is basically the same direction that is in the 1986 Forest Plan.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
68	33	IF	<p>This guideline is very problematic. First, areas compatible with timber production are disproportionately burdened with meeting the mature forest desired condition. Based on tables 2 and 9, only about 7% of the total Shoshone NF acres or 12% of the forested Shoshone NF acreage is identified as compatible with timber production. Despite that, the proposed plan requires that 50% of high elevation Douglas-fir mature forest, 25% of low elevation Douglas fire mature forest, 33% of spruce/fir mature forest, and 50% of lodgepole pine mature forest, as outlined in desired condition on p 15 and 16, be located on those lands identified as compatible with timber production.</p> <p>Second, for all practical purposes this guideline permanently removes the lands identified for mature age class for timber production. It is not silviculturally possible to manage lands for timber production on a rotation length of 80 to 120 years, depending on the species, and still maintain 10% of those lands in mature age class, plus 1,000 acres in 250-acre blocks.</p> <p>Third as written, the guideline would apply to watersheds where any timber harvest is compatible with desired conditions and objectives. By definition projects in those areas would be designed to achieve desired condition other than timber production, and there is no reason to constrain management of those lands with this guideline.</p> <p>I recommend you delete guideline</p>	<p>The direction is similar to that in the 1986 Forest Plan. This was included based on the historic range of variation finding that age class distribution is younger in harvested areas. The guideline does not attempt to maintain the mature age class at the high levels found throughout the rest of the Forest, but rather seeks to avoid the loss of that component from areas that receive harvest. Given the small extent of harvest on the Shoshone, it is unlikely the lower level of mature age class outside the range of historic variation at the Forest level. The guideline is based on the 1986 Forest Plan. The desired condition for the whole Forest has the higher percentages of mature stands.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
68	33	NL	10% mature age class species seems low when compared to historic conditions. This Guideline should be revised to more closely adhere to historic conditions.	This was included based on the historic range of variation finding that age class distribution is younger in harvested areas. The guideline does not attempt to maintain the mature age class at the high levels found throughout the rest of the Forest, but rather seeks to avoid the loss of that component from areas that receive harvest. Given the small extent of harvest on the Shoshone, it is unlikely the lower level of mature age class outside the range of historic variation at the Forest level. The guideline is based on the 1986 Forest Plan. The desired condition for the whole Forest has the higher percentages of mature stands.
68	33	RO	Assume the ecosystem diversity guideline is not supposed to match pg 15& 16. These numbers seem high if most of a 6 th field HUC is timber production. There may be issues with how much timber is available in the various 6 th field HUCs. Ensure these numbers are reasonable.	This is basically the same direction in the 1986 Forest Plan.
69	1	EG	There's no ecological basis for this prescribed pattern; 30 acre stands might be adequate for nesting goshawks, but whether or not fires at a small scale (HUC6) would have provided this pattern is unknown. An adequate range of patch sizes will occur on the 85% of the forest in wilderness/roadless.	The 30 acres is tied to the 1986 Forest Plan. We made a tie to the 1986 Plan for those elements that seemed to work. The 30 acres is a minimum so the average stand size will be larger than 30 acres. We have also added the 250-acre blocks for a portion of the mature stands. The 250 acres is based on woodpecker home range. This standard maintains a level of mature stands in managed areas that are below the level desired across the rest of the Forest. There is additional discussion in the species of interest report.
69	3	IDT	I recommend we remove min number of blocks and min acres and block size. These will vary across the forest and by landscapes and land type association.	The sizes are based on habitat needs for particular species.
69	4	IF	I don't see any reason to have a guideline that duplicates and refers to another guideline, so I recommend you delete this one.	Snag guidelines have been reworked.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
69	8	EG	The 1988 fires suggest that a HUC6 is too small a scale to assure long-term snag distribution. HUC5 is the appropriate scale	Similar to previous comments, we are not trying to replicate natural events of the largest scales. We would suggest that using the HUC6 scale for direction will actually lead to a better distribution than using the HUC5 scale. 1986 Plan management is based at a scale similar to HUC6 and data indicate that snag levels have been maintained.
69	12	WP	Migration Corridors seem to be missing here.	They are included as part of the habitat connectivity section.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
69	13	GF	<p>Connectivity Corridors: Recommend adding the following language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important wildlife migration corridors are managed to be barrier-free on the Forest. • Habitat fragmentation (primarily from road construction/travel management) is minimized, and current status of habitat effectiveness is maintained. • Highway/road right-of-ways along, or crossing, migration corridors are seeded with unpalatable, undesirable native forage species, to minimize use of those areas by wildlife, and thus minimize vehicle/animal collisions. Where possible, and in coordination with WGFD and the NRCS Plant Materials Center, incorporate native species that provide good ground cover, erosion control, but are not desired by wildlife species. • Any new fences built along big game migration corridors should be wildlife-friendly. If deemed unnecessary for resource management, existing fences should be modified or removed. <p>Road construction and re-construction projects (e.g., Togwotee Highway, Beartooth Highway) should implement measures (e.g., underpasses, overpasses) to reduce or mitigate animal/vehicle collisions and loss of animals, and to facilitate connectivity between seasonal habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetative manipulations (e.g., logging, prescribed burning, etc.) are designed to maintain habitat fragmentation within the natural range of variability. Specific habitat connectivity needs are provided on a case-by-case basis (e.g., bighorn sheep, amphibians, neotropical birds in riparian areas). 	<p>Desired condition covers much of this in general language. Unpalatable species are usually non-native species. We are required to use native species, which are mostly palatable. We are already constrained from using palatable non-native species. A guideline for fences is included in the plan. Addressed in management approach</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
69	14	EG	Delete guideline. The language provided under objectives should provide sufficient direction	We are retaining the guideline. Unintentional barriers to streams and riparian are one of the few problems the Forest has with stream health. Most of these are from past activities and are slowly being addressed. We feel this is an important enough issue to include this direction. We did reword the guideline to address the possibility of short-term impacts.
69	18	GF	The last phrase can be dropped from this paragraph. "On big game winter ranges, management activities that disturb big game should be conducted outside the season of use or mitigated to reduce disturbance to big game when the activity is necessary to maintain or improve winter range conditions."	We left the guideline as it was.
69	18	IDT	Add statement on restricting motorized use	Motorized use is covered by the desired condition and the seasonal use guideline.
69	18	NL	Winter range needs stronger protections. Management activities conducted outside the season of use should have minimum possible impact on forage ground. Grazing on winter range should be done early, and should leave more than enough forage for the anticipated needs of wintering wildlife.	These guidelines provide the necessary direction.
69	19	EG	Rewording suggestion: On big game winter ranges when management actions are needed to sustain or improve forage production, evaluate whether management activities that disturb big game should be conducted outside the season of use, or mitigated to reduce disturbance to big game when the activity is necessary to maintain or improve winter range conditions. Consider each situation individually. In some situations management actions may have little effect or even provide a beneficial effect from arboreal lichens within treetops.	We kept our wording, which addresses any activity that occurs in winter range, not just activities needed to sustain or improve forage. The last two sentences are more along the lines of implementation. We incorporated some of that into the management approach

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
69	23	EG	Rewording suggestion: On big game winter ranges, commercial livestock grazing should be used as a tool to maintain vegetative productivity, increase palatability of forage for elk and other wild ungulates, and, to the degree possible, avoid forcing elk onto private land prematurely. Avoid negatively impacting the quality and quantity of forage for wintering wildlife. Following use by commercial livestock, the remaining forage quality and quantity on big game winter range should be adequate to provide sufficient big game forage at current population levels.	Again, we kept the wording similar to what we had. The first two suggested sentences are worked into the management approach for livestock grazing.
69	23	MC	Guideline is misleading because commercial livestock grazing can be used as a tool to provide better forage for wintering wildlife	The guideline is directed at curbing any negative impacts. It still allows for activity that would improve conditions.
69	26	IDT	Replace last sentence with - On big game winter ranges, commercial and domestic livestock grazing should be managed to maintain or enhance forage condition and quantity to meet wildlife winter range habitat needs.	The grazing section was rewritten. This comment is included in the management approach.
69	29	EG	Suggested wording: Sustain current levels of elk security (Table 3), measured at the herd unit or 6th code hydrologic unit scale. Temporary reductions of security within individual winter ranges are acceptable to meet aspen regeneration and other forage goals.	The guideline is not needed. Secure habitat is based on open public roads. A temporary reduction would not be needed to conduct a project, since traffic on a road that is already closed to the public can be limited to administrative use.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
69	29	GF	<p>Recommend adding the following language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road/travel management is combined with vegetative management and topography to maximize benefits of available cover. • New roads and trails open for vehicular use are located to take advantage of topographic screening; roads are typically be located off of ridgelines, but above riparian areas. • Functional timber “screening” is maintained along motorized travel routes, where possible. 	<p>The plan is focusing on providing secure habitat as defined. These are methods of addressing areas with low secure habitat. Incorporated into the management approach section.</p>
69	32	EG	<p>Wording suggestion: Where species of concern are present, management activities should be designed to maintain the mix of naturally-occurring habitats as defined by the HRV. Short-term adverse impacts on species of concern are acceptable when disturbance is needed to sustain long-term habitat conditions and when such short-term impacts are unavoidable during comparable, natural disturbances (fires, insects, floods, etc). should avoid negatively impacting species populations (put table 2 from report in appendix).</p>	<p>We agree that wording needs to be changed. Suggestion was considered in new wording.</p>
69	32	WP	<p>Species of Concern: “management activities should avoid negatively impacting species populations” Even when the FS was required to monitor populations it rarely if ever occurred. So now populations are never monitored so how would the FS know that populations were being impacted? It cant know, so this nice little statement put in to make folks think there is concern for Sensitive Species is of not the slightest value.</p>	<p>The monitoring plan will address monitoring. The Comprehensive Evaluation Report illustrates that species have been monitored over the planning period.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
70	2	WP	If the FS was serious about protecting YCT or preventing listing it would be implementing PACFISH/INFISH like requirements.	The referenced requirements are designed for an area different from the Shoshone. The cutthroat trout populations are being protected under other guidance, including Watershed Conservation Practices handbook, Yellowstone cutthroat Region 2 species conservation assessment, and the Yellowstone cutthroat conservation agreement. Assessments/agreements are direction?
70	3	NL	"Within 300 feet" by itself is inadequate. The distance from cutthroat trout streams should be increased if there are steep slopes or loose terrain, and should comply with the "Wild & Scenic Rivers Act" where applicable.	The 300 feet was dropped and tie was made to Watershed Conservation Practices Handbook which has needed direction. The wild and scenic rivers direction is not necessary for the continued management of cutthroat trout.
70	3	RO	Yellowstone cutthroat trout and riparian guidelines require avoiding negative impacts. These guidelines would be incompatible with timber production areas. Ensure timber production areas are not within 300' of cutthroat streams or within 100 meters of boreal toad or Columbia spotted frog habitat.	This is a matter of scale. Timber production is a generally suitable designation. It is not made with the idea that each riparian area, steep slope, unstable soil, or other localized situation would be mapped out of the timber production area. Site-specific analysis will determine the degree to which timber production prescriptions and activities can be applied to each area.
70	27	EG	Short-term interruptions in nectar sources created by prescribed spring burning are acceptable when that activity poses the only economically-viable option for sustaining early seral vegetative communities required by butterflies.	This qualification was not added. Species of concern are of such limited distribution that we do not want a prescribed burn to risk impacting the population when eggs and larvae are developing. At this point, we do not know that burning is necessary during the time of egg and larvae development to maintain the communities. Plan direction can be adjusted or revised in the future if further study indicates there are no other options.
71	8	RO	1. Cut and paste problem. 2. Why not include habitat? I suggest editing the existing sentence to say, "Where this species is present, management activities should avoid negative impacts to this species and its habitat."	Wording changed

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
71	13	EG	Considering the current distribution of mature forests on the SNF the Wildlife Society's assessment that goshawks are not at substantial risk in the West, and the fact that ~85% of the forest is managed for wilderness and roadless, these measures are sufficient to sustain viable populations of goshawks without individual nest protection. Nest failures attributable to disturbance in the ~15% of the forest that is developed are acceptable and do not constitute a risk to long-term sustainability.	We agree with your assessment that the goshawk is not at risk on the Forest. We still feel we want to have the guideline for nest direction. The Shoshone is involved in a regional monitoring assessment of goshawks and many of our Greater Yellowstone Area neighbors have plan direction for goshawks. Until the current work leads to some information, we believe it is prudent to maintain the direction to protect known nests. It appears that goshawks occur at a low density on the Shoshone so the impacts to management activities are likely to be very limited.
71	13	IDT	Check with the Black Hills on this one...they actually have management regimes set up to meet desired conditions for goshawk.	We do not need the extensive direction that is used on the Black Hills because our management activities are not nearly as intensive or widespread.
71	13	NL	Guidelines should include efforts to identify unknown goshawk nests when proceeding with management projects.	The low natural occurrence of goshawks and the limited area of impact on the Forest do not warrant this type of management guideline.
71	22	EG	Fencing is not economically viable or desirable when other options exist.	Guideline was dropped. Instead it was replaced with reference to Watershed Conservation Practices Handbooks measures which accomplish the same purpose.
71	22	EG	Protecting toad nursery habitat or yearlong frog habitat was already addressed in objectives that addressed roads and exotic fish. You already have objectives that recruit beaver and willow and guidelines that address grazing and pesticides. No need for overkill.	Guideline was dropped. Instead it was replaced with reference to Watershed Conservation Practices Handbooks measures which accomplish the same purpose.
71	25	IDT	Cover should be greater than 50% in areas with frogs and toads, but should be specific to the site's potential. Cover for frogs and toads is considered as emergent vegetation (sedges or willows) or upland vegetation (grasses or forbs). Don't like wording, but the thought is there.	Guideline was dropped. Instead it was replaced with reference to Watershed Conservation Practices Handbooks measures which accomplish the same purpose.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
71	25	NL	Management activities around suitable boreal toad or Columbia spotted frog habitat should be 100 meters or more, depending on slope and soil composition.	Guideline was dropped. Instead it was replaced with reference to Watershed Conservation Practices Handbooks measures which accomplish the same purpose.
71	32	NL	“The use of fish-killing chemicals” is considered for bolstering native trout populations on some streams, and this seems to be at odds with other desired conditions for game fish. How does the forest balance killing off nonnative fish species in some streams and rivers with introducing non-native fish into new areas on others? (see p. 46, Riparian group - program strategy.)	These are the types of tradeoffs that are evaluated in site-specific project analysis. The language on page 46 was modified.
72	8	IDT	I think we’d be hard pressed to maintain this snag level as in some areas our aspen does not get that large...9 inches might be a maximum. I would drop the minimum dbh requirement to 6 or 7 inches.	Direction was modified to match 1986 Forest Plan direction.
72	12	RO	Need to explain what is intended with snags patches distributed across 6 th field HUCs where timber harvest occurs. Is this intended to include areas with high proportion of timber production? The salvage guidelines seem inconsistent with timber production. Reword this to ensure it is not inconsistent with timber production areas.	Snag direction has been reworked. Density direction is similar to the 1986 Forest Plan. Direction for salvage of burned timber was changed to make the intent more clear. Both pieces of direction are compatible with timber production.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
72	18	EG	Made a number of comments on the snag section.	<p>Snag numbers were lowered to those comparable to the 1986 Forest Plan. These snag numbers only apply to managed areas. Since snag numbers are much higher in unmanaged areas, snags levels across the Forest are within historic range of variation levels. The direction in managed stands is designed to maintain distribution across the Forest.</p> <p>We believe that HUC 6 is the appropriate scale for this direction. See previous response on HUC5.</p> <p>The direction on salvage and burned stands has been reworded to make the intent more clear. We agree that this guideline will usually not be a constraint. We included it because past records show that it may have been constraining in the late 1990s.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
72	18	IF	<p>I recommend retaining the current forest plan direction for snags. The forest plan general direction for snags requires, for forested diversity unties., at a minimum, an average of 20-30 snags (in all stages of development) per 10 acres, well distributed over the diversity unit. The forest plan Standards and guidelines require a minimum of 6-10 snags, greater than 10" dbu for ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir and spruce-fir and greater than 8" dbh for aspen and lodgepole pine, per acre. As pointed out in the draft ecosystem diversity report, Harris (1999) did find higher numbers of snags in uncut stands in western Montana than required by the current Shoshone NF forest plan (although he didn't make that specific comparison). However, the discussion of management implications in Harris (1999) contains three alternative strategies for achieving snag densities, specifically, 1) snag density targets for individual cutting units that approximate those for uncut stands, 2) snag density targets for a landscape, and 3) snag density targets that are a mix of strategies 1 and 2. Given the very small percentage of the Shoshone National forest available for timber production, the very high densities of snags throughout the Shoshone NF, and the monitoring report finding that the current forest plan snag standards and guidelines proved sample snags for Hairy Woodpecker, I recommend the third strategy as outlined in Harris (1999), which I believe equates well to the snag direction form the current forest plan. I also recommend using a single number for desired number of snags instead of a range. 2 snags per acres instead of 2 to 3 snags per acre.</p>	<p>Direction for snags was modified since this version. Additional direction was added for coarse woody debris. Both pieces of direction are based on 1986 Forest Plan direction.</p>

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
72	19	IDT	These seem high. I would also note that snag recruitment is important esp. in our mid to late seral stages. I recommend we lower the actual snag numbers and include a guideline for snag recruitment (i.e. 2-4 snags per acre and 6-8 trees with desired snag characteristics).	Direction was modified to match 1986 Forest Plan direction.
72	22	IF	I recommend that you delete the guideline that limits salvage of burned timber in its entirety. Guideline would virtually eliminate salvage of burned timber on the Shoshone NF, and in all likelihood eliminate opportunities for timber production the affected lands. Again the acres available for timber harvest on the Shoshone NF are very limited, and there is nothing in any of the forest plan revision documents to suggest that the proposed limitation on salvaging burned timber are necessary.	Documentation in the species of interest report describes the reason for the direction. Direction was reworked so the intent is clear. Direction would generally not limit the salvage of burned timber.
72	22	NL	When discussing a salvage timber sale in a burned area, some discussion should be given to post-fire forest health and meadow and aspen conditions in regards to ground compaction and impacts of mechanical extraction, as well as to stipulations to protect watershed health.	All direction for the protection of other resources during the harvest of green timber would apply to the harvest of salvage timber.
72	31	IDT	Include stands in areas suitable for timber production	Direction was reworded.
73	1	EG	Sage grouse habitat is too marginal and peripheral to be of significance at the statewide level. The inappropriate emphasis detracts from other more important species.	We disagree. See response under desired conditions.
73	23	EG	This original statement leaves too much room for misinterpretation and is too fine-scale to be of use in a Forest Plan.	Reworded to better define intent

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
73	23	MC	Under Hall's fescue guidelines plan component shouldn't use 50 percent but be more general in nature. Likewise for the montane plant group on page 74. also, what about recreation impacts.	Reworded to match current management direction
73	23	RO	Utilization seems high, and guideline could be more specific. Chuck Quimby advises me that upland fescue utilization normally is in the range of 35-45%, so 50% seems like too much. Also, the standard could be written to make it clear that you are talking about utilization of Hall's fescue, regardless of what the level of utilization is on other species (as written, it might mean 50% utilization of the general forage in the pasture). I suggest consulting with Chuck Quimby about reducing the guideline to something in the 35-45% range, and clarifying the guideline to say something like, "...utilization should not exceed XX% on Hall's fescue."	Reworded to match current management direction
73	23	WP	50% utilization to protect sensitive areas? Current range science does not even support 50% in normal situations.	Reworded to match current management direction
73	27	EG	Rewording suggestion: Where this species is present, management activities should be designed to minimize short-term disturbances recognizing the inevitable short-term adverse impacts of natural disturbances.	Reworded to better define intent
73	27	RO	1. Cut and paste problem. 2. Why not include habitat? As for Absaroka goldenweed, I suggest editing the existing sentence to say, "Where this species is present, management activities should avoid negative impacts to this species and its habitat."	Reworded
73	31	IDT	Is direction on roads relative for a wilderness plant group.	Wording adjusted

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
74	2	NL	Guidelines should include language that indicates a plan to monitor the effects of grazing on these two plant groups. Guidelines should also consider the option of resting the plant groups to allow native species to recover.	Monitoring is addressed in the monitoring section.
74	3	RO	Does this guideline imply that it is OK to have negative impacts from domestic grazing when water levels are high? I'm not sure why this guideline is restricted only to "times of below average water levels." Consider making it a general guideline for avoiding negative impacts from livestock grazing period.	Livestock impacts are not an issue during normal to wet years in these areas because livestock generally do not enter the area. In drier years, cows can enter and cause damage from trampling.
74	8	MC	Under Hall's fescue guidelines plan component shouldn't use 50 percent but be more general in nature. Likewise for the montane plant group on page 74. also, what about recreation impacts.	Reworded to match current management direction
74	8	RO	Again, the 50% utilization seems high, and guideline could be more specific. Also, the standard could be written to make it clear whether you are talking about utilization of these particular species, or the pasture as a whole. I suggest consulting with Chuck Quimby for advice on whether or not 50% utilization is too high. Also, please clarify whether the % utilization applies to the pasture as a whole, or to the montane plant group as a whole, or to any one of the species. (In other words, if XX% utilization occurs on one or two of the montane plant group species, will the livestock be allowed to remain until utilization of all species in the group are down to that percentage?)	Reworded to match current management direction

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
74	11	NL	Concerns with side effects of herbicides and pesticides should be addressed.	The revised plan does not direct the specific use of herbicides or pesticides but acknowledges those tools as options to promote forest and rangeland health. Specific use of these control measures is addressed in the forest's "Weed environmental assessment and decision notice." That document will be updated to address specific issues as necessary.
74	12	IDT	Source of other direction under invasives. Shoshone National Forest Noxious Weed Environmental Assessment (1999)	Added
74	18	SF	The fire and fuels management section does not contain any information regarding the implementation of the Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP's). CWPP's are certainly an important tool for the management of our resources and there should be some mention about the implementation of the existing CWPP's as well as future implementation of CWPP's currently being developed in this section.	Direction placed in chapter 2 management approach.
74	27	RO	Change from unwanted wildfire to unplanned ignition	Unwanted wildfire is the appropriate wording for the direction we want.
74	30	RO	How can fire and fuels management improve water quality.	Over the long term, vegetation activities could result in a healthier watershed.
74	30	RO	Suggest these guidelines should be moved to watershed section.	Moved guidelines under watershed heading
75	22	IF	Per the description of guidelines on page 68, I see no need to repeat FSM direction for regeneration harvests.	Section was modified to follow the 2008 Planning Rule.
75	22	SF	Forest Products Guidelines. The plan component paragraph should be rewritten to make better sense. The sentence does not flow correctly.	Section was modified to follow the 2008 planning rule.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
75	32	EG	Any required reduction in herbivory will be spread equitably between wild ungulates and domestic livestock. Recognizing conflicts between domestic sheep and wild sheep, the SNF will not provide permits for domestic sheep or goat outfitters in areas where there is occupied sheep habitat.	Reduction will be addressed at the project level. Plan direction is to sustain both. Additional information was included in the management approach to discuss herd numbers with the Game and Fish Department during times of prolonged weather-induced forage reductions. Sheep and goat direction is provided.
75	32	SA	Suggested other sources of guidance US Forest Service Manual, FSM 2200 - Rangeland Management US Forest Service Handbook, FSH 2209.13 - Grazing Permit Administration Handbook US Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region, Rangeland Analysis and Management Training Guide	Did not feel we need these standard handbook and manual direction referenced.
75	36	RO	Guideline reads like a desired condition instead of a guideline	Changed
76	1	RO	Guideline reads like a suitability statement - its not a guideline	Moved to appropriate place
76	4	NL	Mineral development should not reduce the roadless character of inventoried Roadless Areas.	Guidelines and suitable uses are designated where roadless characteristics can change based on recreation settings. Roadless areas identified as back country do not allow the construction of new permanent roads.
76	4	RO	Need to be clear on what is for leasable and what is for locatable. Limitations on how far locatable can be moved.	Reworked the section
76	6	GF	Crucial big game winter ranges are either not leased, or leased for oil/gas and minerals only with proper protections for wintering wildlife and adequate mitigation for any impacts that may occur. WGFD's document, " <i>Recommendations for Development of Oil and Gas Resources within Crucial and Important Wildlife Habitats</i> ", is used as a source of best management practices for dealing with development on crucial big game ranges.	This document will not be referenced in the revised plan. The Game and Fish Department is welcome to provide recommendations from this document as they cooperate on site-specific project NEPA.

Page number	Line number	Commenter code	Comment	Response
76	10	GF	Given the WGFD comments relative to Page 56, Suitable Uses/Minerals, language on Page 76 should be modified: Within bighorn sheep winter range, elk winter range, and within ½ mile of bald eagle or peregrine falcon nest sites:	Section was reworked. Guidance for oil and gas in winter range will come from the 1995 Oil and Gas Leasing Record of Decision.
76	22	RO	Statement only addresses “within utility corridors”, however the majority of risk to continued service and fire ignition comes from vegetation outside the corridor. The Region is currently evaluating vegetation management guidelines and direction for both. Would suggest consulting with Michele O’Connell in RO regarding how the LMP could address vegetation management guidelines both within and outside the corridor.	Wording was adjusted
77	19	IDT	Roads should be designed constructed and maintained to the minimum standard necessary to meet desired conditions.	Wording adjusted