



Colville and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests

Proposed Action for Forest Plan Revision

Region 6

Summary of Public Comments Received on the Proposed Action (Scoping)

Version – January 15, 2013

This is a draft report that will be updated as we move through the steps to develop the draft environmental impact statements (DEISs). Additional information will be added as it is developed. The draft report provides a useful synopsis of public comments from the 2011 public scoping process, and the main issues which help to frame the range of alternatives to be analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

January 2013



Plan Revision Team
1240 Second Ave.
South,
Okanogan, WA
98840

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Content Analysis Summary	1
Content Analysis Process for Scoping	2
Plan Revision Issues for the Colville and Wenatchee National Forests	6
SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	6
Significant Issue 1: Old Forest Management	6
Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans	6
Public response to the proposed changes	7
Significant Issue 2: Motorized Recreation	8
Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans	8
Public response to the proposed changes	9
Significant Issue 3: Road Density	9
Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans	9
Public response to the proposed changes	10
Significant Issue 4: Preliminary Administratively Recommended Wilderness	11
Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans	11
Public response to the proposed changes	12
Significant Issue 5: Livestock Grazing	13
Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans	13
Public response to the proposed changes	13
Significant Issue 6: Wildlife	14
Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans	14
Public response to the proposed changes	14
Significant Issue 7: Riparian and Aquatic Resource Management	15
Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans	15
Public response to the proposed changes	16
Appendix A – List of Commenters	17
Appendix B – Content Analysis Results	38
Issues - 1	40
Access	40
Alternatives	41
Aquatic and Riparian Systems	41
Climate Change	42
Grazing	42
Colville NF – Management Areas	43
Okanogan-Wenatchee NF – Management Areas	48
Both Forests – Management Areas	57
Minerals and Mining	60
Recreation	60
Renewable Forest Products	62
Scenery	62
Social and Economics	62
Vegetative Systems	62
Wildlife Habitats	62
Alternatives - 2	64
Access	64
Alternatives	65
Aquatic and Riparian Systems	67

Collaboration – Colville	68
Collaboration – Okanogan-Wenatchee.....	68
Collaboration – Northeast Washington Forestry Coalitions.....	69
Colville NF – Management Areas.....	69
Okanogan-Wenatchee NF – Management Areas	69
Both Forests – Management Areas.....	69
Wenatchee Mountain Coalition Proposal.....	70
Recreation.....	70
Renewable Forest Products	70
Vegetation Systems	71
Wildlife Habitats	71
Non-Issues and Other Comments (3a – 3h).....	71
Already Decided by Law, Regulation, or Policy (3a)	71
Outside the Scope of the Proposed Action/Irrelevant to Decision To Be Made (3b).....	73
Relevant to the Proposed Action and Are To Be Addressed in the Analysis Plan (3d)	80
Non-Substantive (3e).....	111
Editorial Comments to the Document (3f)	111
Comments to Incorporate By Reference (3g).....	124
Management Area Suggestions (3h).....	124
Appendix C – List of Preparers	144
Appendix D – Project Contact Information.....	145

Introduction

The Colville and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests published the Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on June 30, 2011 for the Proposed Action (PA) to revise their Forest Plans, which began the scoping comment period, ending on August 29, 2011. A 30-day extension was granted per public request, which resulted in the comment period ending on September 28, 2011. A scoping letter with a detailed Proposed Action was mailed via U.S. postal mail to 258 stakeholders and emailed to 2,207 stakeholders with links to information on the project web site. In addition, 9 public open houses were held in Colville, Republic, Omak, Wenatchee, Spokane, Newport, Yakima, Cle Elum, and Seattle consecutively on July 16, 28, 30, and August 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, and 13 consecutively. In addition, two informational webinars were held on August 9 and September 1. News releases were sent to both Forest's public affairs news media distribution lists from which many local and regional news outlets published the story.

Scoping for public comment is a valuable step in the analysis process and is designed to share the Proposed Action, gather new information, define the overall scope of the analysis, and ultimately identify the Issues that will be used to develop the alternatives and otherwise refine the analysis. All of the comment letters were read and analyzed using a process called content analysis, which was completed by a third-party contractor, and is described in more detail in the following section. In addition to the reports that were produced from the content analysis process, every letter was read by at least one of the Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) members. The Forests appreciate the time and perspectives shared by each commenter and the willingness of all to engage in the revision of the Forest Plans.

Content Analysis Summary

We received a total of 27,274 comment letters, of which 889 contained unique and substantially different comments (see Appendix A for a list of commenters). In addition, there were thirteen different form letters received from 26,385 individuals (see project record for a list of the form commenters). The letters, emails, form letters, and public comment forms were received from tribes, individuals, organizations, agencies, businesses, and groups and were received from 15 states in the United States and British Columbia, Canada; however, this doesn't include state affiliation for all of the form letters (see complete list in the project record).

Of the 889 comment letters, there were 3,250 comments that were coded, analyzed, addressed, and entered into an Access database (DB). The comments in the master copy of each of the form letters were coded once because in content analysis we analyze the unique and substantive and form letters, no matter how many are received, contain the same comments/concerns; therefore the concerns are captured through coding once into the DB.

The 3,250 coded comments were assigned a subject and category code, which groups like-comments by subject and category (see coding structure in project record). Public concern statements (PCs) were written that summarize the like-comments in each category and every coded comment is associated with a PC. There were a total of 252 public concern statements written for the 3,250 coded comments.

Appendix A contains a list of all the commenters, their assigned contact number, and the associated Public Concern statements (PCs) with their comment letter. The list is organized alphabetically with organizations/agencies/businesses listed first followed by individuals. See the project record for the list of all the commenters who submitted a form letter because they are not included in Appendix A. See the Content Analysis Report in the project record for a detailed report, which includes all the coded comments by PC.

Appendix B contains all of the PCs organized by Issues, Alternatives, and Non-Issues/Other Comments. To find your comments, which are contained within the PCs, locate your Contact ID# and/or the PC #'s from Table 1 in Appendix A that are associated with your name, and then find that PC and/or your Contact ID# in Table 3 in Appendix B.

Content Analysis Process for Scoping

We followed a systematic process of carefully logging-in, numbering, reading, coding, and summarizing all viewpoints and concerns that were submitted. The comments that were most helpful were those that were unique, substantially different, and were specifically related to the PA. In addition to capturing unique and substantially different comments, this report attempts to reflect the emotion and strength of public sentiment in order to represent the public's values and concerns as fairly as possible. When an individual raised multiple concerns within the same letter, each unique comment was numbered and tracked separately. Each comment within a comment letter was assigned a unique tracking number and coded by subject and category.

Once the unique and substantially different comments were coded, concerns raised by different commenters on the same subject and with the same intent were grouped by subject and category code, which captured the essence of those like-concerns. In this way, multiple comments may be addressed by one response (see Appendix B).

This report attempts to provide fair representation of the wide range of views submitted. Every comment has the same value, whether expressed by many, or by one respondent. Analyzing comments is not a vote-counting process. The Forest Service response to the public comments was not determined by majority opinion but rather by the substance of the comments. The content analysis process ensured that every comment was read, analyzed, and considered. All original and coded comment letters can be found in the project record.

The main objective of scoping is to ultimately identify the issues that will be used to modify the Proposed Action (PA), develop alternatives, and/or refine the analysis. Comments that define a cause-effect relationship between the PA and its effects that reflect a dispute are called 'significant issues'.

Comments determined to be a significant issue must be:

- An unresolved conflict that needs to be addressed
- Something not already addressed by law, regulation, or agency policy
- Something that is within the Forest's authority to address
- Something that is within the scope of the purpose and need for action

- Something that has sufficient scientific data and available information to conduct a meaningful analysis and to make a reasoned decision

Significant issues often describe unwanted potential effects which can be mitigated and/or resolved by modifying the PA or developing project design features to address specific concerns. Issues not resolved as such may be addressed in the environmental analysis by developing effects indicators for each Issue, and/or by developing alternatives to the PA. Effects indicators are measurable indicators of change that are linked to the Issues, have a cause and effect relationship, and provide a way to assess how the alternatives respond to the Issues. All new alternatives must meet the project's purpose and need, relate to a significant issue, and be consistent with existing law, regulation, and policy.

In general, the topics determined to be secondary issues did not meet the criteria listed above, and did not receive a wide range of comments about the proposed changes. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations explains this delineation in Sec. 1501.7, "...identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review (Sec. 1506.3)..."

Although many comments were classified as a secondary issue, it should be understood these comments are not arbitrarily dismissed. They continue to provide information useful to the plan revision task.

The following process was used to sort through public comments to determine which concerns will be raised to the level of **significant issues** and which should not. The Forest Service response to all of the comments can be found in Appendix B.

Step 1: Identify and Categorize Substantive Comments

The contractor read, analyzed, coded, and entered into an Access database all of the substantive comments within the scoping comment letters using the content analysis process described above and the coding structure found in the project record. The comments were categorized into the following subject areas and then Public Concern statements (PCs) were written for the like-comments within each category code within the subject areas:

- Access System (Transportation)
- Alternatives
- Aquatic and Riparian Systems
- Best Available Science
- Climate Change
- Collaboration
- Cultural Resources
- Grazing
- Colville Management Areas
- Okanogan-Wenatchee Management Areas
- Minerals
- Monitoring
- Non-Significant Issues
- Plant Habitats
- Process and Miscellaneous
- Recreation
- Renewable Forest Products
- Scenery
- Social and Economics
- Soils
- Tribal
- Vegetative Systems
- Wildlife Habitats

Step 2: Classifying the Substantive Comments

The IDT worked with the contractor to review the PCs and associated comments and assign one of the classification codes below. The comments that are sorted into classification codes 1 and 2 below are covered in the **Issues** section and are also referenced in Appendix B. The comments that are sorted into classification codes 3 below can be found in Appendix B, along with the Forest Service response:

1. **Issues.** Issues generally relate to resources that may be impacted by implementation of the PA and cannot be resolved through routine or standard project design features or mitigation measures. An Issue is most often addressed by development and analysis of an alternative to the PA or modifying the PA; in some instances where the Issue does not meet the criteria for Other Comments (*see 3. Non-Issues below*) and requires more non-standard site-specific mitigation measures or project design features, it is included as an Issue. Issues may also be addressed in the environmental analysis by developing issue-specific effects indicators.
2. **Alternatives.** The public may suggest new alternatives, new components to the PA or show support or disagreement with the PA or alternatives proposed. The Issues generally guide alternative development; however there are comments that affect other relevant resources that may not guide alternative development but are critical to understanding the importance and difference of the alternatives. These are then considered by the IDT and the line officer to determine if they warrant further consideration or detailed analysis.
3. **Non-Issue and Other comments.** A comment may fall into this classification because of the following reasons:
 - a. already decided by law, regulation, policy, Forest Plan, or other higher-level decision;
 - b. outside the scope of the PA (the issue is not part of the proposal or is not affected by it) or irrelevant to the decision to be made;
 - c. conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific or factual evidence;
 - d. relevant to the PA and are to be addressed in the analysis plan, and/or has limited duration or intensity of impacts or are already planning to measure or mitigate the impacts through project design features or mitigation measures.
 - e. non-substantive - lacks site specificity or clarity to understand the meaning of the comment (viewpoints, values, opinions, beliefs or assertions with no rationale)
 - f. editorial comments to the document. These are factual corrections or comments specific to a particular section of the document that do not fall into one of the classifications above;
 - g. comments that request to be incorporated by reference; and/or
 - h. comments that are management area suggestions but are not identified as issues.

Step 3: Identify Issues and Effects Indicators

The IDT has identified the main issues from the Public Concern statements and original letters to assist in developing the range of alternatives to be analyzed and documented in the DEIS. They used the description of issues and non-issues shown in the classification coding in Step 2 as a guide. Some of the issues can be addressed through design features incorporated into the PA and all action alternatives, and/or new alternatives developed. Some of the Issues that cannot be resolved may be addressed in the environmental analysis by developing issue-specific effects indicators. These indicators should be measurable, predictable, and responsive to the Issue. Issues and their effects indicators are reviewed and approved by the line officer. *[This report will be modified to further describe indicators when that information becomes available.]*

Plan Revision Issues for the Colville and Wenatchee National Forests

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

The seven topics identified for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as being significant or key issues are old forest management, motorized recreation, road density, preliminary administratively recommended wilderness, livestock grazing, wildlife, and riparian and aquatic resource management. These issues also have several sub-issues. To provide a greater understanding about these issues, the Colville and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests have provided an explanation of our proposed changes, followed by a summary of the range of comments we received from the public. The issue statements capture the points of dispute the public has with the proposed action.

The Forest Service identified the following seven significant issues:

Significant Issue 1: Old Forest Management

The proposed landscape approach may not provide old forest habitat as well as the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest's Northwest Forest Plan reserve system and Eastside Screens, or the Colville National Forest's Management Prescription 1 – Old Growth Dependent Species Habitat and Eastside Screens.

This approach may a) cause a decrease in the supply of commercial timber products, which may have a detrimental impact of the local economy, b) limit the Forest Service's ability to reduce the risk of wildfire or suppress wildfires, especially adjacent to local communities.

Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans

In the revision of the Forest plans, three broad scale concerns drove the need to consider how we address old forest management, especially the current reserve system approach at the landscape scale. These are:

- The recent history of uncharacteristic levels of disturbances resulting from fire and insect and disease activity that will likely continue into the future.
- The interaction between disturbances and climate change that elevates the importance of restoring landscape resiliency.
- Uncertainty about the recovery and viability of old forest-dependent species given the increased risk of uncharacteristically severe disturbances that is likely to be exacerbated by climate change impacts.

The proposed action described management of old forest vegetation by providing desired structural stage distribution for multi and single strata old forest across the landscape. To meet the large tree desired conditions, old trees and enough of the younger larger trees would be retained. Retention of large, younger trees that are in the best condition and are not limiting growth of nearby old trees through resource competition would be prioritized. Desired conditions for old forest habitats would be at, or towards, the high end of the range of variability (considering historical and future variability) within areas that are capable of providing old forest habitat structures. Desired conditions would be described by conifer dominated vegetation group. Habitat capable areas would include the

following forest series: Douglas-fir, grand fir, western hemlock, and Pacific silver fir. If habitat amounts were not currently available, areas would be identified for future old forest habitat. The proposed action did not zone the Forest into reserves and matrix or general forest.

The proposed action also described details for providing old forest habitat for specific focal wildlife species (e.g., American marten, northern goshawk, and northern spotted owls).

The current Forest plans divided the Forests into areas that are managed for old forest habitat in reserves (late successional reserves, managed late successional areas, or old forest management areas) and areas that are not required to retain any old forest structure referred to as matrix or general forest.

Public response to the proposed changes

Reviewers generally agree that vegetation plan direction should emphasize healthy forests, focus on ecosystem restoration, and support a variety of resource objectives, ranging from creating and maintaining diverse plant and wildlife habitats, managing invasive species, to maintaining scenic values while providing for forest products. They also generally agreed that it is desirable to have old and very large trees on the Forests.

The public did express concerns about moving to a Forest-wide approach of providing old forest and not remaining with a reserve system (Northwest Forest Plan) or a diameter limit (Eastside Screens). Reasons given for their concerns varied among the reviewers and could be grouped around three major concerns.

Public Concerns

- Commodity outputs that affect the local economy
- Wildfire suppression
- Wildlife habitat that depends on old forest structure

- Reviewers were concerned about whether the proposed approach would actually provide old forest habitat better than the current reserve system or diameter limit approach.
- Reviewers expressed concerns that the supply of commercial timber products could be negatively affected and this would have a detrimental impact on the local economy.
- Reviewers stated concerns that the proposed approach would limit the Forest Service's ability to reduce the risk of wildfire or suppress wildfires, especially adjacent to local communities.

Significant Issue 2: Motorized Recreation

The location and amount of motorized recreation that could be authorized under the proposed action could affect wildlife species, the distribution of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities, and local county economies.

This approach may a) affect the recovery and viability of wildlife species that are sensitive to motorized recreation activities, b) adversely affect the contribution of motorized recreation to local economies, c) may not adequately address the contribution of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities on the national forest.

Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans

The current land management plans provide direction for summer and winter motorized uses, including identifying areas where such use may not be authorized or is limited, mainly for protection of aquatic, plant, and wildlife habitats.

The proposed action would continue to provide recreational access on National Forest System lands and a wide range of recreational opportunities while limiting or prohibiting winter and summer motorized activities in certain areas in order to provide quality aquatic, plant, and wildlife habitat. Other areas, such as wilderness, are closed to motorized use to provide a range of recreational experience.

The goal for recreation settings and experiences would include providing a spectrum of high quality, nature-based outdoor recreational settings where visitors access the Forests, including access to the biological, geological, scenic, cultural, and experiential resources of the Forests. Where the visitor's outdoor recreational experience involves few conflicts with other users, access is available for a broad range of dispersed recreation activities such as dispersed camping, rock climbing, boating, mushroom and berry picking, hunting, and fishing and these experiences are offered in an environmentally sound manner, are within budget limits, and contribute to the local economy.

It should be noted that the proposed action makes broad, strategic decisions that apply at the landscape scale. The 2005 Travel Management Rule prescribed a process for making site-specific decisions to designate roads, trails and areas for motorized travel thereby closing undesignated roads, trails and areas to motorized use. Over the past few years, travel management planning has occurred on the Forests in a separate planning process with the objective of providing a Motor Vehicle Use Map showing roads, trails and areas designated for summer motorized use and resulting in the closure undesignated roads, trails and areas for summer motorized use.

Public response to the proposed changes

Reviewers supported the Forests continuing to provide a wide range of recreation opportunities although opinions vary greatly about the amount and location of motorized use to include.

- Reviewers have indicated a desire to know what to expect in terms of motorized recreation settings, opportunities, and restrictions for specific geographical areas during each season of use.
- Reviewers were concerned about potential impacts to wildlife habitat of motorized recreation.
- Reviewers expressed concerns about impacts to the local economy of restrictions to motorized recreation opportunities.

Public Concerns

- Location and amount of motorized / non-motorized recreation
- Wildlife habitat impacts
- Contributions to local economy

Significant Issue 3: Road Density

Road density being considered under the proposed action may not a) provide the desired level of access for recreation use, wildfire suppression, and vegetation management activities such as commercial timber harvest, b) effectively contribute to the viability of aquatic, plant and wildlife species, or c) adequately minimize resource impacts.

Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans

Three broad concerns drove the need to address road density:

1. The Forest is no longer able to afford to properly maintain road system at current operational maintenance levels
2. The current road system is not aligned with current and future resource management objectives
3. The existing road management direction is confusing and difficult to follow because it is scattered throughout current Forest plans (Colville Land and Resource Management Plan, Okanogan Land and Resource Management Plan, Wenatchee Land and Resource Management Plan), forest plan amendments (Northwest Forest Plan, East-side Screens, Interim Inland Native Fish Strategy for the Intermountain, Northern, and Pacific Northwest Regions [INFish, USDA Forest Service 1994c and 1995], Interim Strategies for Managing Pacific Anadromous Fish Producing Watersheds in Eastern Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Portions of California [PACFish, USDA and USDI 1995]), national level decisions (the Roadless Rule), and interim policy (e.g., Grizzly Bear No-Net-Loss, Lynx Agreement, The Interior Columbia Basin Strategy)

The current Forest plans include much direction about managing the road system; the Northwest Forest Plan directs Forests to reduce “the amount of existing system and non-system roads within Key Watersheds through decommissioning” or have “no net increase in the amount of roads in Key Watersheds” (NWFP ROD pg. B-19&C-7).

The proposed action provided a strategic vision to guide the location and overall density of roads in the future. It included management areas that delineated where there is a need to manage for specific road densities. These are the Active Restoration Management Areas 2 and 3. These areas have aquatic and wildlife habitats that would benefit from reducing the negative impacts of roads by managing towards road densities of 2 miles or 3 miles per square mile. A wide spectrum of travelway types would be present in Active Restoration 2 and 3, ranging from maintenance level 1 through 5 roads, or primitive roads to highways. Road densities would include all maintenance levels and be measured within each management area within a 5th field watershed.

The proposed action stated that the goal is for the Forests to continue to have an access system of authorized roads that is safe, affordable, and environmentally sound, that meets obligations to public and private cooperators, and is efficient to manage. However, any National Forest System road that is not needed to meet resource or social and economic objectives, and/or user-created roads, would be decommissioned and the landscape restored.

Public response to the proposed changes

There is general agreement about the need to manage the national forest road system to reduce or avoid environmental impacts, and operate within budgets. Public comments around road management were mainly in response to the proposed action description of limiting road densities within two management areas – Active Restoration 2 and Active Restoration 3.

- Reviewers would like the current inventory of roads to remain unchanged, mainly to provide the current level of access for recreation use, wildfire suppression, and vegetation management activities, specifically commercial timber harvest.
- Reviewers expressed a preference for a decrease in the amount of roads to minimize environmental impacts to water (streams, rivers, and lakes), aquatic, wildlife and plant habitat to provide unroaded areas for wildlife habitat and human recreation, and to have a better maintained road system.
- Reviewers differed in opinion on whether 2 or 3 miles per square mile road density was the appropriate density to provide desired aquatic, plant, and wildlife habitat conditions. Some felt the numbers could be higher while others felt the numbers should be lower.
- Reviewers weighed in on what type (maintenance level) of road should be included in road density analysis, as well as the method of determining road densities.
- Reviewers expressed concern over the location of roads, with roads that are adjacent to, or hydrologically connected to, streams and rivers having a greater impact on aquatic species.

Public Concerns

- Level of access to provide recreation, wildfire suppression, and vegetation management
- Amount of road inventory to minimize resource impacts
- Methods of determining road densities

Significant Issue 4: Preliminary Administratively Recommended Wilderness

The recommendation of preliminary administrative wilderness in the proposed action and resulting designation may a) result in a loss of revenue for local economies from recreation and vegetation outputs b) reduce opportunities for summer and winter motorized vehicle use, mountain bike use, and c) increase the costs of wilderness management.

Recommendations of preliminary administrative wilderness in the proposed action may not include areas that have outstanding wilderness characteristics deserving of wilderness recommendation, or include areas that benefit biological connectivity. Also, the proposed management direction for preliminary administrative wilderness areas may not maintain wilderness character.

Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans

By law, all National Forest System lands must be evaluated for possible wilderness recommendation during the plan revision process. The result of that evaluation shows whether a need exists for additional wilderness and what trade-offs may exist if the area is eventually designated part of the national wilderness system.

Currently, the Salmo-Priest Wilderness covers about three percent of the Colville National Forest and evaluation showed a need for additional wilderness opportunities on the Forest. A review of possible areas showed some are available to fill this need. The Colville Proposed Action considered recommending around 101,000 acres of additional wilderness. About 13,500 acres would be recommended for addition to the existing Salmo-Priest Wilderness and the remaining 87,500 acres would include recommending portions of the Abercrombie-Hooknose, Bald Snow, Profanity, and Hoodoo potential wilderness areas.

The Okanogan-Wenatchee Proposed Action considered recommending around 125,800 acres in scattered parcels adjacent to existing wilderness areas. All parcels would be managed as recommended wilderness, where existing uses would continue until Congress took action on the recommendation.

The proposed actions shared information on the national approach to managing any recommended wilderness, which is that, prior to congressional designation, uses continue that do not compromise wilderness eligibility. When congressional designation is complete, these areas are managed according to the desired conditions for designated wilderness in the Forest plan. The proposed actions went on to clarify that the following selected activities could continue to be authorized in Preliminary Administratively Recommend Wilderness Areas:

- Summer off-highway vehicle use and winter motorized use (existing use could continue, but no additional use is allowed).
- Mechanized uses (existing use could continue, but no additional use is allowed).
- Vegetation management activities would not be authorized in Preliminary Administratively Recommend Wilderness Areas.

Public response to the proposed changes

Reviewers were divided about whether any additional wilderness was needed. Those opposed to additional wilderness often cited the amount of designated wilderness on the Forests or in Washington as a basis for their opposition. Reviewers favoring additional wilderness often pointed to parts of the Forests with, what they felt, were outstanding wilderness characteristics deserving of wilderness recommendation. And they cited the benefits to wildlife habitat from wilderness designation as supporting the need for additional wilderness.

Public Concerns

- Adding or removing proposed recommendations
- Managing recommended wilderness

When it came to responding to the specific areas proposed for recommendation, opinions differed widely.

- Reviewers suggested specific areas be removed from recommendation and others suggested specific areas be added.
- Reviewers recommended fewer areas because wilderness areas are costly to manage.
- Reviewers recommended fewer areas because wilderness areas restrict uses and activities, especially summer motorized vehicle, snowmobile, and mountain bike use.
- Reviewers felt additional wilderness would negatively affect the economy of the surrounding communities while other reviewers cited the economic benefits of wilderness.
- Reviewers suggested specific areas that would contribute to habitat connectivity for wildlife species.

When reviewers responded to the Forest Service proposal on how to maintain the wilderness character of PARW, they expressed different opinions. Some agreed with the Forest Service proposal. Others expressed the following concerns.

- Reviewers suggest managing recommended wilderness where all motorized use is prohibited.
- Reviewers recommended restricting mountain bike use while others thought mountain biking should be allowed and, where possible, upgrade or construct more trails for mountain bike use.

Significant Issue 5: Livestock Grazing

The proposed action may not a) be effective in managing the level of risk of disease transmission from domestic sheep to bighorn sheep, b) adequately provide social/economic values of livestock grazing while providing high quality recreational settings and ecological conditions.

Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans

Livestock grazing is authorized through a permit system that allocates forage for grazing. Allotment management plans provide site-specific details for management of the resource and identify mitigation measures needed to reduce identified impacts in order to meet or move toward management objectives.

Historically, the national forests contributed to the local and regional social and economic environment. Many eastern Washington communities developed strong natural resource based economies supported by national forest resources in the mining, logging, and grazing industries. Over time, additional values about forest management activities became increasingly important such as protecting and enhancing the ecosystem, and providing high quality recreational settings. These activities also generate additional contributions to the social and economic environment through resource management and restoration activities, and tourism.

The proposed action continues the existing management direction for livestock grazing and adds information about desired plant community structure and diversity. The proposed action clarifies that recreational grazing is subject to the same management direction as permitted livestock grazing. Management for providing forage for both livestock and wildlife would continue and rangelands would continue to offer multiple benefits beyond livestock grazing.

The Forest Service proposes to work with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to develop management strategies for livestock grazing. Strategies would include managing potential bighorn sheep and domestic sheep interactions, bighorn sheep habitat management, and habitat effectiveness for bighorn sheep.

Public response to the proposed changes

Livestock grazing remains a controversial use of the national forests and this was reflected in the comments. Reviewers' comments ranged from wanting to decrease the amount of management direction for livestock grazing to wishing to remove all livestock grazing from the Forest.

- Reviewers were concerned the proposed action didn't adequately deal with the risk of disease transmission from domestic sheep to bighorn sheep.
- Reviewers said the management emphasis should give priority to livestock over wildlife, in other words they expressed concerns over how management direction may affect the social and economic value of livestock grazing.

Public Concerns

- Risks of disease transmission
- Social and economic values

Significant Issue 6: Wildlife

The proposed action may not a) provide an effective percentage of grizzly bear core area [Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest only], b) have sufficient land allocations with the appropriate management direction to contribute to habitat connectivity for wildlife species such as wolverine or grizzly bear, and c) provide a supply of firewood for local use due to snag habitat requirements.

Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans

The proposed action responded to a recovery plan for grizzly bears in the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Area that was completed in 1997 and outlined the steps needed to recover grizzly bears to a viable population level. Two of the recovery steps addressed in the proposed action were:

- Designation of management situation areas.
- Development of an access management strategy that would replace the interim policy that has been in place since 1997.

The access management strategy for the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Area followed the access management guidance provided by the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC). These changes pertain only to the portion of the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest that lies within the North Cascades Grizzly Bear Recovery Area. Core area numbers are included in the proposed action.

The proposed action emphasizes providing habitat connectivity, the need to provide wildlife and aquatic crossing structures, and managing activities adjacent to the structures so they are utilized by wildlife.

Public response to the proposed changes

From the comments it is clear the public looks to the national forests to provide wildlife habitat for numerous species. Many wrote of how they value the national forest for wildlife viewing, hunting opportunities, and contributing habitat for endangered species. The major concerns were over how a revised Forest plan could best continue to deliver these values.

- Reviewers' comments about grizzly bear management centered on whether the long-term core area percentages would be effective in contributing to quality grizzly bear habitat.
- Reviewers expressed concerns about providing for biological / habitat connectivity for wildlife through the spatial arrangement of management areas and the types of activities allowed in those management areas, such as motorized recreation, road building, and levels of road density. The need for biological connectivity was often given as a rationale for having more areas recommended for wilderness or allocated to management areas that do not allow road building.
- Reviewers expressed concerns that the amount of firewood cutting allowed on the Forest would result in fewer snags for wildlife. They felt the proposed action did not include strong

Public Concerns

- Grizzly bear habitat
- Providing biological and habitat connectivity
- Firewood cutting and loss of snag habitat

enough direction to prevent the loss of snag habitat. Others were concerned about a continuing supply of firewood from the Forest.

Significant Issue 7: Riparian and Aquatic Resource Management

The proposed action may not a) provide as effective aquatic resource protection in riparian areas as provided by the current forest plan direction, commonly known as the Northwest Forest Plan's aquatic conservation strategy; and the amendments commonly known as the PACFISH and INFISH guidance, b) effectively manage the detrimental effects of roads, livestock grazing or motorized recreation within riparian areas.

Proposed need for change to the current Forest plans

The current forest plans include riparian management direction from the Northwest Forest Plan, the Interim Strategies for Managing Anadromous Fish-Producing Watersheds in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, and portions of California (PACFISH, USDA and USDI 1995), and the Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH, USDA Forest Service 1994c and 1995). These approaches appear to have either maintained or improved riparian and aquatic habitat conditions at the watershed and larger scales. The changes presented in the proposed action combined the three separate pieces of direction into one place, the revised forest plan, and fulfills the intent of replacing the interim direction (PACFISH and INFISH) with longer-term management direction.

Riparian management areas are designated in the current forest plans. The proposed action carried forward this approach with some changes in widths and more information on desired conditions for riparian areas. Generally, the area widths would increase on those lands within the INFISH amendment area, for lakes and ponds greater than one acre and intermittent streams. Riparian Management Areas would remain the same for those areas of the forests within the NWFP and PACFISH amendment area.

Riparian Management Areas would include portions of watersheds where aquatic and riparian-dependent resources receive primary emphasis and where special management direction applies. Riparian Management Areas would be designated for all permanently flowing streams, lakes, wetlands, seeps, springs and intermittent streams, and unstable sites that may influence these areas.

Riparian Management Areas give emphasis to maintaining or restoring the riparian and aquatic structure and function of intermittent and perennial streams, confer benefits to riparian-dependent plant and animal species, enhance habitat conservation for organisms that are dependent on the transition zone between upslope and riparian areas, contribute to improved water quality and flows, and contribute to a greater connectivity of the watershed for both riparian and upland species.

Desired conditions for Riparian Management Areas within any given watershed are to have compositions of native flora and fauna and a distribution of physical, chemical, and biological conditions commensurate with natural processes.

Public response to the proposed changes

Management of riparian and aquatic resources was a concern to a number of reviewers. Everyone generally agreed that having high quality aquatic habitats and clean water is a good thing. Reviewers have specific concerns with the proposal to combine the existing riparian direction.

- Reviewers had concerns that changes in Riparian Management Area widths would not be effective for east-side conditions or the methodology for establishing the widths is not effective.
- Reviewers had concerns about road impacts on fish and other aquatic ecosystem processes. Specifically, the hydrologic disruption and sedimentation to streams created from the amount and location of the road system.
- Reviewers felt that motorized recreation is so detrimental to riparian habitats that the use should not be authorized in RMAs.
- Reviewers felt the existing plan direction, with an emphasis on standards, is more effective in managing riparian areas and aquatic resource impacts from such activities as; livestock grazing, recreation facilities, roads, etc. in riparian areas, than the proposed action approach, which puts more emphasis on guidelines.

Public Concerns

- Effectiveness of Riparian Management Area widths
- Motorized trails and road impacts
- Livestock grazing

Appendix A – List of Commenters

Following is the list of commenters organized alphabetically by organization, business and/or agency first, and then by individuals. To find your comments and the Forest Service response to your comments, locate your Contact ID# and/or the PC #'s from the commenter table below that are associated with your organization/name and then find that PC and/or your Contact ID# in Table 3 in Appendix B.

Table 1. Commenters, Contact ID Number, and Public Concern Statement Numbers

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
49 DEGREES NORTH SKI AREA	EMINGER	JOHN	806	26A, 115, 116, 126, 127, 130, 145
ACCESS CONSERVATION TEAM NORTHWEST	WEATHERMAN	ERIC	585	28, 40A, 40, 50, 52, 116, 123, 133, 149
ALPINE LAKES PROTECTION SOCIETY	RAYMOND	CHARLES	595	4B, 4, 14, 56, 57, 59A, 59, 65, 65A, 66A, 68A, 69A, 71, 71A, 74, 94, 115, 120, 124, 138, 140A, 140, 147, 170
AMERICAN BIRD CONSERVANCY	HOLMER	STEVE	302	14, 166, 170A
AMERICAN FOREST RESOURCE COUNCIL	PARTIN	TOM	547	7, 14, 28A, 75, 75A, 79, 84A, 88, 102, 105, 112, 113, 118, 138, 139, 140, 147, 153, 163, 164
AMERICAN MOUNTAIN GUIDES ASSN, OUTWARD BOUND	GOLDBERG	LEIGH	581	128, 129, 130
AMERICAN RIVERS, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, AMERICAN WHITEWATER, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY, WASHINGTON WILDERNESS COALITION, ALPINE LAKES PROTECTION SOCIETY	NONEMACHER	DARCY	573	46A, 66A
AMERICAN WHITEWATER	OKEEFE	THOMAS	587, 605	4B, 7, 10, 56, 65, 66, 66A, 125, 133
ASSN OF OKANOGAN COUNTY SNOWMOBILE CLUBS	WINDSOR	TOM	358	70
AVISTA CORPORATION	CARROLL	NANCY	363	92
BACK COUNTRY HORSEMEN OF WASHINGTON	CHAPMAN	JEFF	24, 93, 520, 610	4, 4A, 10, 10A, 33, 65, 66A, 77, 77B, 78, 79, 84, 85A, 85, 86, 115, 125, 133
BACK COUNTRY HORSEMEN - OKANOGAN VALLEY CHAPTER	SWANBERG	DAVID	700	67, 68, 70
BACKCOUNTRY HORSEMAN - WENAS VALLEY	DROUGAS	MICHAEL	135	85A
BACKCOUNTRY SKI AND SNOWSHOE CLUB	BEKKER/SENDERO	GUS/EL	488	10, 14, 31, 57A, 77A, 77, 86A, 117, 118, 120, 124, 126A
BBSC/WSSA NORTH CENTRAL ATV CLUB	ALLARD/COPPOCK	GARY/DICK	64	11, 70, 70A, 86, 86A
BLUE RIBBON COALITION	HAWTHORNE	BRIAN	636	14, 111, 116, 118, 120, 123, 157, 163, 170
BUTTE BUSTERS SNOWMOBILE CLUB			45, 129, 271, 272, 486, 751,	50, 56A, 68A, 69A, 77, 77A, 85, 86A, 103, 124, 124A
CHELAN COUNTY NATURAL RESOURCE DEPT	KAPUTA	MIKE	583	4, 31, 33A, 33, 54, 56, 57, 66A, 67, 68, 74, 98, 130, 138, 139, 161A, 161, 165

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
CHELAN COUNTY PUBLIC UTILITY, DISTRICT # 1	HUDSON	KIRK	622	7, 92, 127
CITY OF ENTIAT	VANDEBURG	MAYOR KEITH	699	4, 15, 19, 19A, 22, 31, 34, 54A, 56A, 57, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66A, 67, 68A, 72, 79A, 98, 103, 123, 130, 136, 142, 148, 150, 151, 154
CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE COLVILLE RESERVATION	FINLEY	MICHAEL	615	40, 43, 48A, 96, 145
CONGRESSWOMAN	MCMORRIS	CATHY	535	28, 86, 142
CONSERVATION NORTHWEST	HEFLICK	DAVID	625	4, 4A, 7, 10, 14, 17, 20, 26A, 36, 38A, 38B, 38, 47, 54A, 98, 116, 120, 124, 130, 133, 135, 140, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 153, 157, 159, 162, 163, 164, 164A, 168, 169, 170, 170A
CONSERVATION NORTHWEST	WATKINS	JEN	599	4, 4A, 4B, 7, 9, 11B, 12A, 14, 20A, 20, 22, 26, 27, 29A, 34, 35A, 35, 54, 54A, 59, 59A, 65, 66A, 66, 68A, 71B, 77A, 77, 85, 86A, 88, 98, 124, 130, 135, 135A, 139, 152A, 152, 153, 156, 157, 159, 161A, 161, 164, 165A, 165, 168A, 168, 170
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS – FERRY COUNTY	MILLER	BRAD	68, 440, 798	13, 50, 136, 137A
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS - KITTITAS COUNTY	CRANKOVICH	ALAN	580	68, 70, 130, 138, 142, 153
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS – OKANOGAN COUNTY	LAMPE	ANDREW	545, 834	7A, 31, 60, 70, 116, 130, 138
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS - PEND OREILLE	HANKEY	JOHN	365	4, 33A, 48, 137A, 142
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS – STEVENS COUNTY	GUENTHER	LARRY	617	4A, 4, 50, 114, 137A, 148
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES - DEPT OF ECOLOGY	EVERETT	AARON	850	6, 14, 15, 19A, 19, 20A, 20, 21, 22, 24A, 24, 35A, 35, 66A, 71A, 79A, 87, 111, 112, 116, 118, 121, 135, 137, 141, 147, 148, 149, 156A, 156, 157A, 157, 159, 165A, 165
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, NOAA	LANDINO	STEVE	438	4B, 4, 23, 23, 34, 130
DOI, NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK	JENKINS	PALMER	528	7, 10, 26A, 31, 64, 71A, 98, 122, 125A, 127, 128, 148, 161A, 161
EARTHJUSTICE (REPRESENTING MANY GROUPS)	BOYLES	KRISTEN	575	14, 22, 118, 152A
EASTERN WASHINGTON ATV ASSN	PREWITT	GARY	519	10, 76, 86, 123, 142
EDGEWORKS CLIMBING INC	BLOXHAM	TOD	492	128, 129, 130
ENTIAWATERSHED PLANNING UNIT	RICKEL	MICHAEL	309	4, 15, 19, 19A, 22, 31, 34, 98, 103, 136, 139, 142, 148, 150, 151, 154
ENUMCLAW TRAILRIDERS	SAUNDERS	TOM	460	10, 66A, 71A, 116, 128
EPA, REGION 10	KUBO	TERESA	833	14, 22, 24, 26A, 34A, 35A, 35, 55, 88, 98, 116, 145, 147, 150, 153, 163, 167
EVERGREEN MOUNTAIN BIKE ALLIANCE, INTERNATIONAL MTN BICYCLING ASSN	GLOVER	GLENN	609	10, 11, 48A, 50, 51, 62A, 86A, 88, 125A, 133

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
EXPEDITIONS NORTHWEST LLC	ALLEN	MARK	291	127
FERRY COUNTY CATTLEMANS ASSN	STRANDBERG	GORDON	835	5, 26A, 31, 33A, 33, 86A, 116, 118, 122, 142, 159
FERRY COUNTY NATURAL RESOURCE BOARD	SHUMATE	SHARON	437	14, 16, 34, 38A, 54, 86B, 98, 114, 116, 117, 137, 148, 157, 169A
FERRY COUNTY TRAILS ASSN	ANTHES	STEVE	432, 750	28A, 48A, 51, 86A, 96
FSEEE	STAHL	ANDY	543	138, 165A, 168
GREAT OLD BROADS FOR WILDERNESS	SPALDING	SHELLEY	479	14, 86
I-90 WILDLIFE BRIDGES COALITION	RAINES	CHARLES	611	59A, 59, 72, 152A, 164B
KAF ADVENTURES	PEARSON	MICK	571	127
KALISPEL TRIBE	OSTERMAN	DEANNE	613	17A, 17, 20, 28A, 48A, 51, 123, 137A, 145
KETTLE RANGE CONSERVATION GROUP	COLEMAN	TIM	498	17A, 26A, 26, 51A, 51, 71A, 72, 86A, 120, 142
KETTLE RIVER MINERALS COMPANY	LOLI	MARK	472	38, 48, 50, 87A, 87
KINROSS KETTLE RIVER - BUCKHORN	IOLI	MARK	841	87A
KITTITAS COUNTY PARK AND RECREATION DIST. #1	PETERSON	VAN	174	29A
KONGSBERGER SKI CLUB	HARKESTAD	RUNE	592, 844	126
LAKE CHELAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	PICTON	MORGAN	619	126
LIBERTY WOODLANDS HOMEOWNERS ASSN	ZALKAN	BRETT	504	56A
METHOW VALLEY BACKCOUNTRY HORSEMEN	UPPER	BENNET	161	10A
METHOW VALLEY SPORT TRAILS ASSN	KAUTMAN	DANICA	724	7, 11, 126A, 126, 142, 150
MOUNTAIN TRAILS GROOMING ASSN	VANNICE	JIM	729	86A
MVBCH	FORD	BILL	281	53
NATIONAL FOREST HOMEOWNERS	VER HOEF	MARY CLARKE	562	120, 127
NORTH CASCADE CONSERVATION COULCIL	FORSGAARD	KARL	561, 820	86A, 93, 120
NORTHEAST WASHINGTON FORESTRY COALITION	VAAGEN	RUSS	314	14, 28A, 37, 37A, 48A, 51, 103, 152A, 152, 152B, 152
NORTHWEST EQUITY INVESTMENTS	KING	DENNIS	753	56A
NORTHWEST MINING ASSN	COMPTON	MARK	588	87A, 118
OKANOGAN HIGHLANDS ALLIANCE	KLIEGMAN	DAVID	364	14, 87
OKANOGAN TRAILS COALITION	COPPOCK	DICK	483	7, 10, 26A, 50, 56, 56A, 63A, 68A, 70A, 77A, 85, 86A, 87A, 114, 123, 142
PACIFIC CREST TRAIL ASSN	WOODS	BOB	474	54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 64, 67, 121
PACIFIC NORTHWEST 4WD ASSN	NETTNIN	EARL	362	4B, 78, 86A, 116, 123
PACIFIC NORTHWEST SKI AREAS ASSN	KADEN	SCOTT	466, 837	26A, 105, 115, 116, 125, 125A, 126A, 126, 127, 133, 142, 145, 152
PACIFIC RIVERS COUNCIL	SCURLOCK	MARY	683	14, 20, 22, 79, 147
RADIATOR ATHLETIC CLUB	JONES	BRUCE	501	14, 48A
SEATTLE CITY LIGHT, CITY OF SEATTLE	LYNN	MICHELLE	578	127

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
SENATOR	HOLMQUIST NEWBRY	JANEA	554	70
SIERRA CLUB WA CHAPTER	LAWLER	MARK	620	4B, 7, 10, 12, 14, 20A, 22A, 22, 23A, 26A, 34, 38A, 48A, 51, 54A, 56A, 56, 57, 58, 59A, 60, 62A, 63A, 64, 65A, 65, 65B, 66A, 68A, 68, 69A, 71A, 71B, 71, 72, 74, 75A, 84A, 86, 86A, 87, 93, 94, 98, 110, 115, 116, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126A, 126, 138, 140A, 142, 143A, 148, 152, 152A, 161A, 164, 164B, 165
SNOWMOBILE ALLIANCE OF WESTERN STATES	HURWITZ	DAVE	33	69A, 77, 86A, 86A, 124, 124A
SPOKANE WINTER KNIGHTS SNOWMOBILE CLUB	FIGG	GREG	604	38A, 50, 123
STATE REPRESENTATIVE	SHORT	SHELLY	565	86, 87A, 137A, 137
STEVENS COUNTY CATTLEMENS ASSN	NIELSEN	RICHARD	652	4, 22, 28, 33A, 36, 36A, 86, 99, 137A, 148, 170
TEANAWAY SNOWMOBILE CLUB	LOW	RICHARD	375	69A, 120
TECK WASHINGTON INC.	BROWN	MARK	293	14, 48, 87A
THE LANDS COUNCIL	JUEL	JEFF	569	7, 14, 20, 26, 66, 71B, 71A, 71, 75A, 79, 86A, 88, 106, 107, 116, 117, 144, 147, 148, 152A, 152, 163, 164, 170A, 170
THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY	DYKSTRA	PETER	177, 839, 840	4, 4A, 4B, 4C, 14, 14A, 18, 19A, 20, 20A, 26A, 48, 48A, 51, 57A, 65, 65A, 66, 66A, 67, 68A, 71, 71A, 71B, 72, 86, 86A, 124, 124A, 125A, 126A, 130, 135, 135A, 142, 152
TRI COUNTY MOTORIZED RECREATIONASSN	BLANKENSHIP	MIKE	381	10, 52, 133, 142
UPPER COLUMBIA SALMON RECOVERY BOARD	HOVER	BUD	829	14, 15A, 19, 22, 88, 116
UPPER COLUMBIA SALMON RECOVERY BOARD	MORGAN	JULIE	607	20
UPPER SALMON RECOVERY BOARD	CARRILLO	BARBARA	171	14, 15A, 19, 22, 88, 116
US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE	BERG	KEN	857	7, 66A, 116, 124, 158, 159, 163, 164B, 165, 168, 170
VAAGEN BROS. LUMBER INC.	VAAGE	DUANE	594	4, 28A, 33A, 38, 48, 51A, 51, 137A, 138, 139
WA ST REPRESENTATIVE/SENATOR	SHEA/BAXTER	MATT/JEFF	124	28
WASHINGTON BUTTERFLY ASSN	WAGAR	AL	81	119
WASHINGTON CLIMBERS COALITION, THE MOUNTAINEERS, THE ACCESS FUND, THE AMERICAN ALPINE CLUB	HAAVIK	DAVE	383	4, 10, 54, 61, 65A, 65, 68A, 77A, 82, 84, 86, 93, 129, 133
WASHINGTON DEPT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE	WHIPPLE	DAVID	858	20, 21, 22, 31, 33A, 35A, 35, 41A, 41, 47A, 56, 147, 148, 155, 156A, 156, 157A, 157, 159A, 159, 160, 169A
WASHINGTON SKI TOURING CLUB	DAVIS	JEAN	170	95, 115, 126A
WASHINGTON STATE DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION	SMITH	JASON	146	74
WASHINGTON STATE HOMEOWNERS ASSN	BURROWS	RICHARD	377	54, 55, 127, 131, 148, 149
WASHINGTON STATE MINERAL COUNCIL	WATERS	BRAIN	693	68, 115

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
WASHINGTON STATE SNOWMOBILE ASSN	GINBURG	BETH	423	30
WASHINGTON STATE SNOWMOBILE ASSN	YOUNIE	PAUL AND RONNA	412, 502	7, 10, 11, 26A, 49, 50, 56, 56A, 63, 63A, 68A, 69A, 70A, 77A, 77, 85, 86A, 87A, 114, 123, 124A, 142, 157A, 160, 163
WASHINGTON TRAILS ASSN	GUZZO	JONATHAN	628	7B, 10, 11B, 14, 51, 71A, 71, 77A, 86A, 125A
WASHINGTON WILDERNESS COALITION	ASKOV/UNIACK	NALANI/THOMAS	598, 830	14, 46A, 51, 66A, 66, 68A, 71A, 71, 72, 78A, 86, 86A, 117, 118, 124, 126A, 126, 152, 152A
WENATCHEE OUTDOORS	DAPPEN	ANDY	495, 608	120, 124
WISE USE MOVEMENT	DE YONGE	JACK	326	14, 19, 24, 27, 34, 54, 57, 66, 67, 68, 68A, 86, 87, 93, 98, 102, 103, 104, 105, 126B, 127, 135A, 137, 138, 140, 141, 147, 149, 151, 170
	ACKERMAN	LAURA	397, 762	53
	ACORD	GLEN	524	86A
	ADAMS	MIKE	151	71
	AHLBRECHT	SETH	19	69A, 70, 70A
	ALLARD	GARY	111	77, 77A
	ALLEN	BRAD	541	86A
	ALLEN	TERENCE	127	51, 137
	ALMQUIST	JON	473	66A
	ALONSO	JOYCE	243	51
	ALSAD	RUTH	787	22, 84A, 84, 86, 86A, 125A, 152, 163
	ALVARADO	MICHAEL	112	56A, 71A
	AMANDUS	JAMES	476	66A
	ANCOCK	FRANK	128	71A, 71
	ANDERBERG	ERIC	759	53
	ANDERSON	DON	361	50, 136, 142, 163
	ANDERSON	JEFF	669	86A, 86A, 123A, 123, 123, 124A
	ANDERSON	KAREN	441	86A
	ANDERSON	NATHAN	752	70
	ANDERSON	ROBERT	324	86A
	ANDERSON	SHAWN	713	53
	ANDERSON	SHEILA	710	53
	ANDES	JEFF	106	124A
	ANONYMOUS		614	71A, 125A
	ANTHES	DEB	113, 749	28A, 53, 119
	ASHLEMAN	SCOTT	558	77B
	ASHMORE	ANDREW	675	20, 48A, 48, 51, 157, 169A, 169
	AUDEL	HAZEN	419	53
	AYARS	BARBARA	406	51A, 51
	BAILEY/NORTHRUP	MARYANN/GAY	786	56A
	BAKER	BROCK	258	53, 119
	BAKKE	PAUL	878	71A, 86A
	BAKKE	SUSAN	382	86, 86A
	BALL	DANIEL	285	71A, 71, 152

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	BALLINGER/LAPO	JOHN/DEBBIE	286	95, 124A, 126A
	BAMFORD	MICHAEL	289	84A
	BANNING	TIMOTHY	679	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 86A
	BARKER	JOE	602	50, 114
	BARNES	MIKE	526	86A
	BARNUM	GARTH	99	123
	BATHELDER	STEVE	30	86A
	BEADEL	SAMANTHA	346	70
	BEARDSLEE	DENISE	797	53
	BEARDSLEE	GREG	500	77B
	BEARDSLEE	LARRY	273	4, 26A, 50, 123, 124A
	BEATON	JOHN	733	53
	BEENER	CRAIG	757	53
	BENDIXENPARK	KITTY	235	51, 87
	BERG	DANIEL	690, 791	14, 51, 71A, 87, 125A, 152A, 152
	BERMAN	HARVEY	236	51
	BETCHER STICE	ROBIN	838	4A, 4, 7, 11, 25, 34A, 34, 62, 77A, 86A, 98, 101, 111, 115, 120, 130, 138, 140, 142, 143, 148, 150, 153, 163, 170
	BICCHIERI	BARBARA	54	86
	BIGAS	JOHN/PAM	114	4 B, 11, 20, 27, 85, 86, 86A, 98, 103, 134, 138, 141
	BIGGS	WARREN	76	67
	BIR	MARK	283	71A
	BIRCHARD	BILL	414	124
	BIRKE	COLLIN	396	86A
	BIRKS	RAY	333	70
	BISHOP	SPENCER	257	53
	BISIAR	ROSEMARIE	446	53
	BLACK	CHAD	510	86A
	BLACK	JONATHAN	431	39, 53
	BLANDY	JENNIFER	40	50
	BLANKENSHIP	JACQUELINE	706	28, 50, 78, 86A
	BLEWETT	CHRISTINA	229	48A, 51
	BLOCK	MATT	404	86
	BLOCK	SUSAN	261	53
	BLUM	MARGARET	251	53
	BLYTON	ROBERT	277	50, 86A
	BOLENDER	CORINNA	393	86A
	BONIN	LINDA	31	86
	BONN	KEN	551	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	BOONE	RAY	37	65A, 71
	BOUB	FAMILY	398	10, 70, 86A, 170
	BOYNTON	MICKAND VICKI	738	53
	BRADBURN	SARAH	746	51, 53
	BRADBURN	STEVE	748	51, 53
	BRADFORD	DAVE	259	53
	BRAUN	DAVE	241	48, 51

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	BRAUN	DEVYN	247	125A
	BRAUN	EMMA	403	50
	BRAUN	FAMILY	447	53
	BRAUNER	KALVIN	83	71A
	BRENEMAN	MILES	130	51, 138, 164A
	BRIGGS	HOWARD	180	86A, 124A, 140
	BROOKS	ARLENE	597	10, 70, 78, 83, 130
	BROUGHTON	JODI	149	69A
	BROWN	BRYAN	368	53, 86A, 87
	BROWN	HARVEY	214	51, 51A, 87, 164
	BROWN	JEFF	831	77B, 120
	BRUNA	RENEE	765	53, 87
	BRUNSON	BARRY	131	86
	BRYAN	CARL	28, 85	86A
	BUCHWALTER	TIM	648	56A
	BUOB	WILLIAM/TIFFANY	66	30, 86A
	BURCHAM	JANET	484	3, 4A, 10, 11A, 33, 38A, 40A, 41A, 41, 42, 43, 44A, 45A, 47A, 47, 48A, 48, 51, 54, 57A, 58, 62, 65A, 67, 68A, 71B, 71A, 74, 105, 116, 147, 153, 157, 165, 167A, 169A
	BURK	ANNE MARIE	193	51
	BURKART	PERRY	360	70
	BURR	ERIC	278	66A, 66, 93, 124, 130A, 140, 151, 152
	BURSON	ROB	22	86A
	BUTLER	KC	330	70
	BUTTER	LEONARD	428	53
	BYRD	GREG	512	4, 86A, 124A
	BYRD	NICOLE	549	86A
	CADILE	ALMES	13	53
	CAHOON	CLIFFORD	721	53
	CAMPBELL	STEVE	453	53
	CANHAM	RICK	795	53
	CANTIENI	PICO	134	71, 126A
	CAPON	FAMILY	334	70
	CAPPELLANO	ELOISE	426, 732	48A, 53, 87
	CARLSON	SHANE	671	124A
	CARMACK	EDWIN	582	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	CARMICHAEL	KEN	469	50A
	CASILE	ALMES	890	51
	CAWLEY	BRENT	567	124A, 132
	CHAMBERLAIN	GALON	132	51
	CHAPMAN	TED	415	70
	CHAPVELANE	MICHELL	826	53, 87
	CHESTER	DOUG	116	50
	CHESTNUT	JAMIE	643	124A
	CIVITILLO	SARAH	317	10
	CLASSEN	RUDY	525	86A
	CLEVINGER	JOHN	274	71A

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	CLOUGH	MICHAEL	169	86A, 123
	COHEN	MATT	133	86
	COHEN	MATTHEW	181	51A, 51
	COLEMAN	BOB	348	70
	COLEMAN	S	715	53
	COLEMAN	SUE	67	51
	COLETTI	TRAVIS	811	53
	COLLINS	REBECCA	531, 705	124A
	CONNER	DOUG	173	4A, 86A
	CONNER	PHIL	282	13
	CONNOLLY	BRYAN	600	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 86A
	CONROY	JULIE	343	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	COOK	MARISSA	401	53, 87
	COOK	NENA	195	86A
	COOL	SETH	202	51
	CORMICK	BRIAN	352	13, 85
	COSGROVE	EVA	887	71A, 147
	COUNT	JANELL	373	51A, 51
	COX	KEVIN	689	124A
	CRABTREE	BARB	801	53
	CRAMPTON	SUSAN	299	4B, 66A, 71A, 71, 85A, 98, 114, 148, 150
	CRANE	PATRICIA	248, 799	53
	CREE	ANTHONY	384	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 86A, 120
	CROFT	SUSANNE	367	51A, 51
	CRONIN	JIM	209	51, 125A
	CROWDER	JUDY	125	13, 44A, 46, 47A, 50, 86A, 138
	DAHLGREEN	MATT	723	4, 124, 126A, 139, 148, 150, 153, 159, 166
	DAMASO	MICHAEL	165	86A
	DAPPEN	ANDY	345	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	DAVIES	JAMES	213	39, 51
	DAVIS	ALMEDA	305	86A
	DAVIS	CHASE	770	53
	DAVIS	KATHRYN	284	4, 14, 77A, 78A, 86, 126A, 138
	DAVIS	NORA	184	57, 65, 85A, 85, 122
	DAVIS	ROBIN	818	53
	DAWSON	MICHAEL	430	86
	DAY	JAMES	183	66A, 66
	DEAD	END	279	86A
	DEBARGE DAVIS	EILEEN	827	53
	DECKER	PAUL	143, 793	53, 86
	DEKKER	DEVIN	676	69A, 77A, 77, 86A
	DELANEY	NATE	164	86A
	DEPUYDT	RAY	660	51
	DEXTER	FORREST	508	4A, 28, 40, 85, 86A, 86, 137A, 138, 139,
	DIANE	BRICKLES	661	69A, 124A

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	DICKINSON	CHRIS	156	69A
	DICKISON	CRAIG	152	71A
	DILDINE	BRIAN	555	70
	DISTLER	ELINOR	420	51, 87
	DONLEY	DAN	720	53
	DONOVAN	CAVAN	871	71A
	DOUGHERTY	JASON	677	14, 29, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 86A
	DOUGHERTY	PAUL	117	2, 4, 4 B, 7, 86A, 138
	DRINGMAN	DIXIE	36	86A
	DRISCOLL	LINDA	537	86A, 124A
	DRUGGE	DEAN	854	51A, 51, 71A, 77A, 86A
	DUFFEY	TRISHA	233	51
	DUNN	BILLY	249	48
	DUNN	SHAUN	210	51A, 51
	EARL	KERRY	118	4A, 134A, 147
	ECKERMAN	KIMBERLY	624	86A
	ELKINS	ELIZABETH	70	1, 33, 62A, 75, 76, 77A, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86A, 116, 122, 138, 140, 142, 151
	ELKINS	RICHARD & ELIZABETH	52, 650	69A, 124A
	ELLEDGE	DOUG	321	86A
	ELLERSICK	TANIA	612	51, 86A
	ELLIS	JOHN	301	86A
	ELLIS	NATALIE	792	53
	ELLSWORTH	ERIC	179	50
	ENGER	LORENA	25	86A
	ENGLISH	DAN	639	124A
	ERICKSON	PAUL	11	68, 69A
	ERICKSON FAMILY	DANIEL	191	69A
	ERWOOD	STEVEN	457	4
	EVANS	DAVE	471	125
	EVANS	MARILYN	865	71A, 124
	EVANS	PAUL	775	53
	EVANS	SCOTT	26	69A
	EWER	JUSTIN	359	70
	EXNER	JOHNNA	482	20, 86A, 98, 116, 133, 137A, 142, 148, 153
	FAGEN-WIRGES	SUSIE	663	86A, 124A
	FAILEN	JANE	742	53
	FALLER	BOB	731	53
	FARGUHAR	IAN	768	53
	FENNEY	LINDA	764	53
	FERRO	SUSANNE	402	39, 53
	FILER	TEDAND FRAN	176	127, 131
	FISHER	PATRICIA	741	53
	FITTERER	JON	557	116
	FITZPATRICK	DON	843	50, 116
	FORSMAN	MATT	204	51

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	FORSMAN	STEPHAN	108	86A
	FORSYTHE	KAY & WARRNE	516	86
	FOULKE	TOBIN	331	70
	FOUSHEE	DANIELLE	100	27
	FRAKER	RANDY	18	49
	FRANCIES	LEONARD	389	70
	FRIEDMAN	JAY	217	51, 51A,
	FRITZ	FRANCIS	445	26A, 161
	FRYE	CARLL	640	124A
	FUNKE	JAMES	252	53, 87, 129, 163
	FUNKE	KYLE	481	86A
	GALLANAR	MATT	515	86A
	GARDNER	LEN	560	22, 65, 68A, 86A, 120, 124, 152, 163
	GARTNER	CRYSTAL	621	48A, 51
	GAUTHIER	MARC	34	119
	GIBBS	MOLLY	862	71A, 124A
	GILLESPIE	DAN/JAN	137	51
	GILSDORF	BRUCE	16	70
	GIST	DOROTY	590	14, 120
	GLAIM	NICHOLAS	206	71A, 71, 87
	GLICKFELD	LARRY	674	86A, 125A
	GLOVER	GLENN	680	48A
	GOEHLE	CHRISTINE	468	86A
	GOELLER	LARS	332	70
	GOERES	KARL	642	124A
	GOFORTH	BILL	882	71A, 124
	GOFORTH	TAYLOR	881	71A, 86A
	GOOT	YVETTE	119	51
	GORDAN	DAVE	696	53
	GORDON	GREG	779	53
	GRAHAM	TAYLOR	872	71A, 152
	GRASER	JERRY	702, 743	53, 87, 96
	GRAY	SCOTT	98	86A
	GREGG	JIM	288	10A, 11, 15, 61, 64, 65, 80, 98, 103, 116, 126, 129, 130, 140, 149, 154, 159, 170
	GREISWIG		59	86A
	H	KIMBERLY	550	66A
	HAASE	VERN	120	34 , 34A, 50, 70A
	HABLEWITZ	DAVID	318	86A, 120
	HAGGIN	BART	226	51
	HAGGIN	LINDALL	242	51
	HALSEY	WILLIAM	21	86A
	HAMMER	JIM	350	56A
	HAMMOND/PANGAN	THOMAS/ATHENA	485	68A, 71A, 71
	HAMPSON	LARRY	221	48A
	HAMPSON	PETER	459	53
	HANNEMAN	GARY	859	53
	HARDING	RONALD	300	56A
	HARRIS	BRONWYN	552	87

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	HATHAWAY	STEVE	186	86A
	HAUG	ALISON	688	77B
	HAUGHT	LUNELLE	400	53
	HAVENS	RALPH	325	120
	HAWTHORNE	BEN	499	66A
	HAYES	JENNY	435	125A, 126A
	HAYKINS	SABINA	694	120
	HAYS	STEVEN	586	12, 70, 77B, 125A, 125
	HEATH	GEORGE	175	50A
	HEDBLUM	HOLLY	20	86A, 126A
	HEDGE	JEFFREY	255	53
	HEINLEIN	CHAZ	873	71A, 125A
	HELLER	MARGARET	148	51, 86A, 163
	HENNINGS	CASSANDRA	197	51, 87
	HENNINGS	MARIAN	756	53
	HENSLEY	JASON	658	86A
	HERRIMAN	BUTCH	269	86A
	HERSHBERGER	GREG	216	51
	HERTER	DANNY	814	71A, 77A, 86A, 123A
	HESSION	DENNIS	451	53
	HICKENBOTTOM	CHARLES	3	124, 126
	HINKELMAN	LAURA	223	51
	HIRST	ERIC	172	51
	HOAG	CORINNE	497	51
	HOBAN	MIKE	88	86A, 135
	HOFF	PAIGE	877	10, 71A
	HOFFMAN	RON	695	124A
	HOKOM	HELEN	744	51, 53
	HOKONSON	SUZI	458	53
	HOLM	JERRYAND CHRISTINE	268	11, 116, 124A
	HOLMES	EDWIN	405	48, 53
	HOLMGREN-LOVETT	KRISTINE	747	51, 53
	HOLUP	SARA	783, 879	69, 71A, 124
	HOPKINS	CHRIS	275	127, 129, 132, 139, 163
	HUEHNERGARTH	RICHARD	823	133
	HUFF	DANIEL	96	4, 69A, 70A, 86A, 115
	HUMER		794	53
	HUNT	ELWOOD	627	124A
	HUNT	INA & CRAIG	579	77B
	HUTCHINSEN	JANET	185	51
	HUTCHINSON	MATT	427	51A, 51
	HUTTON	VINCENT	189	119
	IDZIOREK	KATIE	436	126A
	ISABEL	CATHERINE	239	51A, 51
	ISE/EDWARDS	TOM/KAREN	32	71A
	IVANENKO	ART	527	
	JACKMAN	JARRED	292	125
	JAKEL	ELLIE	761	53
	JAKEL	JANEL	760	53
	JANICKI	STEVE	570	124A, 132

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	JEFFREY	JUDY	736	53
	JENSEN	CHARLOTTE	728	53
	JENSEN	JACK	734	53
	JEWETT	DAVID	138	98
	JOHNSON	BRIAN	290	123
	JOHNSON	BRIAN & CHEYENNE	442	51A, 51
	JOHNSON	DON	55	44A
	JOHNSON	DONALD	62	14, 15, 20, 23, 31, 33, 36, 78, 81, 86A, 98, 99, 112, 113, 125, 130, 142, 148, 153, 157, 159, 163, 167
	JOHNSON	JANET	455	53
	JOHNSON	KEITH	778	53
	JOHNSON	LORNA	813	31, 45A, 48A, 50, 52, 118
	JOHNSON	RON	668	124A
	JONES	ALDEN	84	86A, 126A
	JONES	DAN	71	50
	JOPLIN	AMBER	208	51A, 51
	JOSE	JULIA	245	53
	JOVANOVICH	ROD	566	69A, 116
	JUEL	JEFF	408	38A, 38, 51A, 51
	JUSTHAM	STEVE	102	10A
	KALOUS	KAY	456	53
	KANTNER	BENJAMIN	687	86
	KARACOSTASQ	STACY	623	65, 66, 77A, 95, 120
	KASCHUTTER	HEATHER	803	53, 87
	KASPER	FAMILY	465	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 120
	KAYS	DENNIS	774	53
	KEENAN	DRUSCILLA	656	71A, 71, 86A
	KEHNE	JAY	809	53
	KELEMAN	BRUCE	10	14, 14A, 24, 138, 141, 148
	KELLER	GARY	424	13
	KELLER	SEMRA	72	51
	KELLEY	JAMES	450	10, 11A, 11, 33, 54, 138
	KELLY	PAT	805	53, 87
	KELLY	PATRICIA	207	51
	KENLEY	JASON	227	53
	KENNARD	SCOTT	511	70
	KENNEDY	JON	490	14, 48A
	KIEFFABER	LOIS	821	53, 87
	KING	DAVID	712	7, 53
	KING	SPENCER	69, 727	4, 11, 53, 86A, 123
	KINNEY	RITA	766	53, 87
	KNIGHT	DESIREE	250	53
	KNOLL	BILL	8	124A
	KNOWLES	DERRICH	678	10, 14, 40A, 48A, 50A, 51, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 137A
	KNOWLES	SCOTT	709	53
	KOCH	GARY	874	71A, 86
	KONIGSMARK	KEN	87	71, 71A

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	KORNHER	KAREN	546	77A, 123A, 125A, 125
	KRENKEL	RICH	653	51, 87, 123
	KURTZ	NOEL	626	124A
	KYLE	GREG	395	86A
	LACKEY	AMY	670	124A
	LAMBACHER	GARY	246	53
	LAMBERT	JEFF	421	53
	LANGLEY	TROY	319	86A
	LARSEN	NILS	816	53
	LARSON	PETER	366	53
	LAU	LEE	413	70
	LEAR	FRED	194	51
	LEDBETTER	CARL	354	71A
	LEE	BYRON	162	13
	LEE	DORIS	740	53
	LEE	JAN & PAULA	464	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	LELAND	RYAN	107, 121	69A, 77, 86A, 124
	LEON	CAROLYN	237	48, 51A, 51
	LEONARD	BRIAN	589	53
	LESTER	KJELL	51	86A
	LEVY	CINDY	568	14, 71A, 79, 164
	LEVY	CINDY	863	23, 71A, 152
	LEVY	MIRE	522	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 86A
	LEWIS	CAROLYN	869	71A
	LILLQUIST	KARL	276	68A, 73
	LILLY	RYAN	328	86A
	LILLYBRIDGE	TERRY	355	69A
	LIPE	HILLARY	338	13, 85
	LIVINGSTON	PENNY	824	53
	LOCKE	MARGO	817	7, 50A, 68
	LOEB	ALEXANDRA	494	10, 50, 51
	LOFDAHL	ROD	491	86A
	LOFT	PETER	754	22, 86A, 152A, 152, 170
	LOTAZ	DAVID	853	71A, 77A, 86A, 124
	LOVER	IRIS	719	53, 87
	LUNDT	ERIC	564	124A
	LYMAN	MICHAEL	725	53, 151
	LYNCH	CHRIS & FAMILY	475	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	LYNCH	DICK	631	124A
	LYNN	DOROTHY	160	86A
	LYONS	MAT	523	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 125A
	MABERRY	RODNEY/MARIE	90	34, 70A
	MABIE	CRAIG	27	71A
	MACK	JEFF	521	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 86A, 133
	MADISON	WENDELL	644	124A
	MAGNUSON	CYNTHIA	880	71A, 86A
	MAGNUSON	ELLEN	883	71A, 123

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	MAGOTEAUX	JOHN	698	33, 96
	MALLON	CHRISTINE/MICHAEL	73	7, 77, 77A, 125, 135
	MALLULA	JEFF	105	124A
	MALLULA	LANE	187	124A
	MALMBERG	GREG	815	71A, 124
	MALMBERG	SHIELA	849	71A, 124
	MANDY	BEV	411	51A, 51
	MANEY	CHIPPER	507	66A
	MANN	LESLEY	784	38A, 38, 48A, 51
	MARIE	LORRAINE	267	34, 86, 98, 123
	MARLOW	BENJAMIN	139	51
	MARUSKA	DORIS	224	51
	MATTICE	ELEANOR	182	23
	MATTS	TED	684	48A, 51, 87, 142, 152A, 152
	MATTY	GREG	91	10
	MAXWELL	JOSH	9	86A, 124A
	MAY	TOM	454	53
	MCALLISTER	KEN	280	38A, 86A
	MCCAMBRIDGE	NANCY	745	51, 53
	MCCART	WES	659	27, 52, 120, 137A
	MCCAULEY	LARHONDA	651	124A
	MCCLURE	DOYLE	298	68A, 93
	MCCLURE	JAMES	244	51, 142, 167
	MCDANIEL	BRYAN	767	53
	MCDONALD	LARRY	295	86A
	MCDONNELL	JESS	664	86A, 126A
	MCGHEE	RONNA	649	124A
	MCGOWAN CONNELLY	SHEILA	860	124A
	MCKEE	SAGE	722	53
	MCKINNEY	KEITH AND MARY	889	4, 56A, 129, 130
	MCLUCAS	TONY	74	51
	MCMILLAN	ROGER	17	119
	MCNABB	AMANDA	347	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	MCPHEE	MILES	380	126A
	MCPHEE	SAUNDRA	356	86A
	MEAD	MATTHEW	655	4, 4A, 7, 10A, 11, 12, 20, 32, 63A, 69A, 69, 70A, 70, 74, 77A, 78, 86A, 86, 116, 122, 123, 124A, 126A, 129, 138, 140A, 140, 142, 147, 148, 149, 150, 163
	MEEKIN	F.ARNE	452	53
	MEESSEN	WILLIAM	2	10, 51A, 51, 53, 86A, 150
	MENDENHALL	DALE	159	86A
	MENDENHALL	JESSE	38	4A, 86A
	MERRELL	KEVIN	682	124A
	MEYER	DAVID	517	69A
	MIKHAELIAN	MARINA	776	53
	MILLER	LAURIE	808	53
	MILLER	SCOTT	538	68A, 93

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	MIR	OWEN	126	87, 123, 163
	MISEK	MORGAN	322	86A
	MITMA	CHRISTINA	369	10, 53, 86A, 87
	MONDAL	JULIE	769	53
	MONDAL	KENNETH	422, 758, 825	53
	MONSEY	CHRIS	634	86A
	MOON	TED & VICKI	449	48A
	MOORE	BJ	681	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 86A
	MOORE	ERIN	533	14, 22, 51, 54A, 65, 66A, 68A, 71A, 75A, 86A, 124, 152, 163
	MORESHEAD	EMILIE	536	78A, 78, 124A
	MORGAN	DAVID	340	71A
	MORGAN	JIM	559	86A
	MORKILL	BARBARA	253	53
	MORRIS	JOHN	828	15A, 53
	MORRIS	SAMUEL	370	53
	MOSES	ORIN	47	86A
	MROGAN	SARITA	374	53
	MULLINS	ROBERT	540	68A, 68, 123, 123A, 124, 138, 139, 152
	MULLINS/BEKKER	ROBERT/GUS	513	124, 124A, 126A , 126, 130, 133
	MUNTER	CHRIS	496	11
	MYHRE	PAUL	785	71A, 124A
	NAPIER	DEBORAH	240	51A, 51
	NASH	JIM	439	31, 50
	NEIR	DAVE	477	124A
	NELSON	CHRIS	6, 150	69A, 86A
	NESS	ANDERSAND/JUDITH	782	56A
	NESS	TROY	861	68
	NEWSCHWANDER	JEFF	43, 110	10, 69 , 69A
	NEWTON	PATRICIA	845	71A, 124
	NIELSEN	GARY	311	10, 14, 50, 52, 123A, 133, 135
	NIEZGODA	SUE	232	51
	NILSEN	BRIAN	296	86A
	NORTHROP	SEAN	616	124A
	NORTROM	PAUL	572	50, 69A, 116
	NORWIL	PAT	832	77B, 120
	OBERDORF	FRED	215	51, 51A, 87
	OLSEN	DAVID	122	35A, 51
	OLSON	DONALD	665	124A
	OLTEAN	NICK	58	7, 10, 38A, 51, 62, 98, 138
	ORTIZ	BERT	553	95, 126A
	ORTMAN	DAVID	392, 591, 781	14, 15, 31, 68A, 93, 105, 137A, 138, 140
	OSBORN	RACHAEL	256	51A, 51,
	OTTO	MEGAN	885	71A, 152
	OTTO	STEVEN	771	28A, 53
	PAINE	CHAD	310	119
	PARKS	DONALE & LINDA	584	4B, 4, 14, 33A, 34, 54, 65A,

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
				66A, 66, 68A, 71A, 71, 79, 86A, 87, 116, 120, 123, 124, 137A
	PARKS	RAYCHEL	848	71A
	PATTERSON	CRAIG	44	4A
	PAYNE	GROVER	167, 812	13, 22, 23, 86A, 116, 148, 151
	PEFFERMAN	BEN	386	86A
	PELTON	STEVE	542	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 86A, 125A
	PERAGINE	LINDA	855	71A, 77A, 86A
	PERERSON	PRESTON	632	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 86A
	PERROW	RON	574	86A
	PERRY	JEROME	788	56A
	PERRY	JIM	307	56A
	PETERS	THOM	692	68A, 69A, 71A, 81, 120, 127, 147
	PETERSEN	MIKE	851	53
	PETERSON	ERIK	101	69A
	PETERSON	JOHN	92	86A
	PETERSON	JOY	75	119
	PETRO	MIKE	394	86A
	PHILLIPPE	BRYAN	518	70
	PHILLIPS	MATTHEW	739	53
	PIERCE	MISY	864	71A, 124A
	POCOCK	KARIN	852	71A, 77A, 86A, 122
	POFF	JACQUELINE	530	29, 50, 78, 86A
	PORNELL	KORD	548	69A
	PORTER	TODD	666	124A
	POTTER	CONNIE	29	119
	POULIN	DAVID	629	124A
	PRATT	RYAN	717	53
	PRENTICE	JON	470	66A
	PREZYNA	ANN	755	22, 65, 68A, 86A, 124, 152, 163
	PRICE	DANIEL	711	22, 28A, 51, 142, 143, 170
	PRICHARD	DOUG	789	114
	PRINTZ	P	4	71A, 124,
	PUBLIC	JEAN	1	27, 163
	PUCCIO	CHRIS	60	27
	QUIN	HOLLY	641	69A
	RANSTROM	PATRICIA	856	71A, 77A, 86A,
	RATCHFORD	TERESE	647	56A
	RAYMOND	CHARLES	685	14, 86A, 120, 140A, 152A, 152, 163
	RAYMOND	KAREN	667	69A
	RAYNE	KEN	810	84A, 86A
	REMINGTON	PETER	846	118
	RICHARD	ANGELA	707	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 129, 133
	RICKER-HARGREAVES	AMETHYST	716	53
	RINGUETTE	STEVEN	42	86A

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	RITZENTHALER	NANCY	387	51
	ROBERTSON	STEVE	842	71A, 77A, 86A, 122
	ROBINSON	JEFF	686	66A
	ROBISON	VERNON	763	53
	ROHDE	DICK	657	124A
	ROLANDS	DAVID	220	51
	ROMBERG	HARRY	630, 870	7, 22, 26A, 46A, 66A, 71A, 71, 86A, 86, 123, 124, 125A, 152A, 170
	ROONEY	TRACY	14	70, 124
	ROSEN	ROBERT	228	86
	ROSS	KEITH	153	120
	ROWAN		140	86A
	ROWE	DEBORAH	231	51, 87, 140, 142
	RUDOLPH	CHRIS	433	77B
	RUGGIERO	STEVE	344	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	RUSH	BETSY	804	53
	RUSH	JASPER	201	67
	RUSH	RICHARD	266	53
	RUSHTON	LYLE	95	70
	RUSSELL	DON	141	24, 86, 100, 170
	RUSSELL	SUSAN	372	77A
	RUTT	TRACY	48	86A
	SABELHAUSE	NICK	306	86A
	SAFRANEK	WILLIAM & MARYLOU	77, 409	51, 53
	SAGER	MARY	78	1
	SALVATORI	STEVE	262	53
	SALVO	ELIZABETH	349	77 B
	SANDER	JOE	807	53
	SANDVOID	LEE	103	86A
	SARRAT	ALI	222	51
	SARRATT	MICHAEL	697	71A, 123
	SARRATT	VALERI	836	71A, 124
	SAUER	JON	378	65, 66, 70, 70A
	SAY	BOB	662	124A
	SCANLAN	SUSAN	297	56A
	SCHAFFER	JULIE	772	53
	SCHILTZ	LAURA	155	14, 51, 51A, 71A, 74, 124, 163
	SCHMIDT	RAZEL	198	119
	SCHMIDT	TAVIS	212	51A, 51
	SCHMIDT	TERRY	142	15, 51, 87, 100, 163
	SCHULDZ	DAVE	316	50
	SCHWARZ	AARON	886	71A, 152
	SCHWIND	STEVEN	691	86A, 125
	SCHWYN	PENELOPE	493	48A
	SCOTT	DEAN	323	10, 11, 70
	SCOTT	SARAH	56	71
	SCOWN	MICHAEL	596	86
	SELDEN	PRISCILLA & LARRY	505	126A
	SELIN	MARK	12, 89	69A

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	SEVERSON	ERIC	532	95, 125A
	SHAW	JULIE	203, 796	51, 53
	SHEA	MIKE & FAMILY	94	123
	SHEERAN	JOE	53	71
	SHEK	BRZAN	339	77 B
	SHELTON	KELLEY	737	53
	SHERIDAN	DAVID	556	86A
	SHERWOOD	CAROL	192	38A, 86A
	SHIELDS	MARYANNE	219	48A, 51
	SHIPMAN	MARK	506	95, 124
	SHRACK	KATE	773	53
	SIMEONE	BOB	123	4, 86A, 123A, 125A, 126A, 138
	SIMMONS	BRIAN	379	56A
	SIMMONS	FRANK	480	56A
	SIMON	RON	166, 313	27, 71A
	SINES	MIKE	577	4, 10, 86A
	SKYLSTAD	STEPHEN	780	69
	SMALL	JON	800	4, 15, 19, 19A, 22, 31, 34, 53, 98, 103, 136, 139, 142, 148, 150, 151, 154
	SMITH	CARIN	489	4, 10, 77A, 86, 95, 126A
	SMITH	CRAIG	104	10A
	SMITH	DAN	158	86A
	SMITH	DAVID	601	50, 114
	SMITH	JESSICA	391	95
	SMITH	KRISTEN	576	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B, 120
	SMITH	LUCY	86	86A
	SMITH	NA	444	123A, 138
	SMITH	NEIL	357	56A
	SMITH	REBECCA	418	51, 53, 87
	SMITHSON	JULIE	5	33, 115, 138
	SNOW	PHIL	529	124A, 130
	SNYDER	JOHN	39	70A
	SPALDING	SHELLEY	884	71A, 86A
	SPEAR	SHARON	234	51
	SPENCER	JULIA	701	22, 44, 51, 53, 124, 152
	STEINGREBE	MARC	335	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	STEWARD	JOHN & CONNIE	342	86A
	STICE	ROBIN	606	11, 34, 56A, 101, 108, 109, 115, 116
	STOUT	KATHLEEN	200	51
	STOUT	KENNETH	199	11, 51, 86A, 124
	STOWELL	DOUG	875	71A, 170
	STROBECK	JAN	726	53, 86A, 125A
	STRONG	JANET	866	71A, 124
	STUCKER	RYAN	61	138
	SUPER	LORAH	603	54, 56A, 68
	TACKMAN	JAMIE	461	124, 124A, 124B
	TARBERT	DENNIS	337	86A
	TAYLOR	TOM	487	10A, 10

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	THEIS	JERRY	270	15, 29, 114, 132, 135, 137
	THEISEN	MICAELA	819	53, 87
	THERSEN	AARON	399, 448	53, 86
	THERSEN	KRISTI	410	53
	THOMPSON	PAT & GALEN	539	48A, 96
	THORBURN	KIM	407	53, 137
	THORMODSGARD	CARY	168	86A
	TIMMONS	CHRIS	593	77B
	TIMPERRO	NICHOLAS	254	51, 53, 87
	TISSELL	CRAIG AND JENNI	888	56A
	TISSELL	PAUL	329	56A
	TOENYAN	MARC	673	10A, 11, 80A, 86A
	TOLIN	TRACEY	509	86A
	TOMKINSON	JACK	351	86A
	TORKAR	ADAM	263	53
	TORTORELLI	TOBY	7	69A
	TRACY	JAQUAN	196	51, 87
	TRACY	JOAN	703	53
	TRAYLOR	RYAN	225	51
	TREPANIER	TED	49	86A
	TRIMAKAS	ANDREW	635	70
	TUCK	STEPHANIE	708	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	TUCKER	DON	353, 730	56A, 77B
	TUPER	MIKEL	260	48
	TURNER	MARK	371	53
	UNKNOWN		41	124A
	VALENTE	JORDAN	503	124A
	VAN DANTZICH	MAARTEN	341	69A
	VAN TROJEN	STEVE	654	124A
	VANDEMAN	MIKE	15, 388	86A, 125A
	VANDEN HEUVEL	KENNETH	429	48, 51A, 51, 53
	VELATEGUI	VICTORIA	867	71A, 86
	WAGONER	BETTER	205	86A
	WALL	KEN	376	51A, 51
	WALRATH	DENNIS	154	69A
	WALTER	BROOKLYN	238	51
	WALTER	JESS	230	48, 51
	WALTERS	DAVE	304	123
	WARD	JEFF	303	127
	WATERS	DANIEL	645	86A
	WATERS	ROLLAND	704	86A
	WATKINS	MARIANNE	714	53
	WATT	EDWARD	790	31, 45A, 45, 77, 86A, 148
	WATT	MARK	637	124A
	WATTS	BEVERLY	390	14, 77B
	WAY	LINDA	144	51A, 51
	WAY	WILLIAM	563	4, 51, 87, 125, 130
	WEILAND	LOU	434	56A
	WEILER	HOLLY	265	53
	WEITMAN	TED	178	36, 122, 149

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
	WERNER	FRED	646	124A
	WESTERBECK	CARY	463	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
	WHAM	GAIL	633	53
	WHEELER	CHELSEY	264	53
	WHITE	LORI	544	86A
	WHITEHALL	WAYNE	163	86A
	WHITMIRE	WARD	534	77B, 86A
	WHITSITT	LARRY	416	53
	WHITTAKER	BOB	63	10, 51
	WHITTAKER	LEYLAND	320	56A
	WHITTAKER	M. FIRMINHAC	336	56A
	WIGSTON	ADRIAN	672	66
	WILCHINS	JULIE	157	4, 71A, 126A
	WILLIAMS	WENDY	462	86A
	WILSON	KATHLEEN	847	29, 71A
	WILSON	STEVE	57	86A
	WINDH	JOHN	115	86A
	WITTMAN	THERESE	777	53
	WOLFE	REBECCA	868	22A, 71A,
	WOMELDORF	JEFF	327	69A
	WOOD	STEVEN	514	124A
	WOODARD	SHEREE	802	51
	WOODLAND	MICHAEL	425	53
	WOOLF	CRAIG	822	53
	WOOTEN	GEORGE	145, 618	7, 8, 14, 22, 35A, 35, 40A, 51, 54A, 56A, 56, 59, 71A, 86A, 98, 116, 148, 152, 152A
	WREN	KENNY	23	69A
	WRIGHT	MEGAN	211	119
	XA	RICHARD	417	53
	YELK	PAUL	287	8, 10, 40, 68A
	YONEMURA	GREG	312	86A
	YONKMAN	FAMILY	478	4A, 4, 86A
	ZALKAN	BRETT	385	56A
	ZANOL	MIKE	467	125A
	ZAPOTOCKY	CINDY	147	33A
	ZARECON	CODY	218	51A, 51
	ZAREMBA	RON/BEVERLY	82	119
	ZIEGLER	RANDY	443	53
	ZIPPER	ROBERT	718	53, 87
	ZWAHL	BRENDA	876	71A, 86
		ELLEN	735	53
		TODD	638	86A
FORM 01			35	10, 51A, 51, 86A, 150
FORM 02			46	30
FORM 03			50	71A, 77A, 86A
FORM 04			65	53, 125A
FORM 05			79	71A
FORM 06			97	22, 65, 68A, 86A, 124, 152, 163
FORM 07			109	4, 14, 14, 24, 26, 26A, 71A, 84A, 84, 86A, 126A, 163

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

ORGANIZATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CONTACT ID#	PUBLIC CONCERN STATEMENTS (PCs)
FORM 08			80	4 B, 14, 19A, 66, 66A, 86, 86A, 126A
FORM 09			136	51, 87
FORM 10			188	69A
FORM 11			294	14
FORM 12			308	14, 48A, 56A, 56, 65, 66, 70, 70A, 77B
FORM 13			315	68A, 93

Appendix B – Content Analysis Results

Table 2 contains the classification coding system and description, along with the associated public comments (PCs), that were used to classify PCs as Issues, Alternatives, and Non-Issues/Other Comments and that are reflected through this document.

Table 3 is a list of all the PCs and associated Contact ID numbers (letter numbers) organized by Issues, Alternatives, and Non-Issues/Other Comments. Each of the coded, substantive comments are reflected within each of the PCs and helped identify and define the Issues, Alternatives, and Non-Issues/Other Comments that will be used in the development of the DEISs and Plans. For a complete list of all the coded comments by PC, see the Content Analysis report in the project record.

Table 2. Classification Codes, Description, and Associated Public Concern Statements

Identification of Issues	Description and Classification Code	Public Concern Statements (PCs)
Issues (1)	An Issue should describe a specific action and the environmental effect(s) expected to result from that action – “Cause-effect”. A point of disagreement, debate or dispute over a proposed action based on environmental effects that can often be resolved by developing an alternative to the proposed action, modifying the proposed action in some way, and/or developing site-specific non-routine mitigation measures or design features. OR The issue cannot be adequately addressed with standard mitigation measures and is not resolved by existing management guidance or direction.	1, 4A, 7A, 10A, 11A, 12A, 13, 14A, 15A, 20A, 22A, 23A, 26A, 33A, 34A, 35A, 36A, 37A, 38A, 39, 40A, 41A, 44A, 45A, 46A, 47A, 48A, 49, 50A, 51A, 54A, 56A, 57A, 59A, 62A, 63A, 65A, 66A, 68A, 69A, 70A, 71A, 73, 74, 75A, 77A, 78A, 79A, 80A, 83, 84A, 85A, 86A, 87A, 123A, 124A, 125A, 126A, 130A, 134A, 135A, 140A, 143A, 152A, 156A, 157A, 159A, 161A, 164A, 165A, 166, 167A, 168A, 169A, and 170A
Alternatives (2)	A new alternative suggested by the public or another agency or group or a new alternative component suggested. OR Suggestions for changes to the alternatives or the proposed action.	4B, 7B, 11B, 14, 17A, 19A, 24A, 28A, 29A, 37, 38B, 65B, 71B, 77B, 86B, 95, 96, 124B, 126B, 137A, 152B, and 164B
Non-Issues (3a – 3h)	3a - Already decided by law, regulation, or policy	25, 30, 31, 92, 113, 114, 117, 118, and 145
	3b - Outside the Scope of the Proposed Action and/or Irrelevant to the decision to be made	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 93, 94, and 121
	3c - Conjectural in nature or not supported by scientific or factual evidence	
	3d - Relevant to the Proposed Action and are to be addressed in the analysis and/or: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts are limited in extent, duration, and intensity due to project design or limited nature of impact (i.e., site-specific road or trail comments) Are already planning to measure or mitigate the impacts through project design features or mitigation measures. 	4, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 87, 88, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 116, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, and 170
	3e - Non-Substantive: Lacks site specificity or clarity to understand the meaning of the comment (viewpoints, values, opinions, beliefs or assertions)	119

Summary of Public Comments on the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville NFs
Forest Plan Revision Proposed Action

Identification of Issues	Description and Classification Code	Public Concern Statements (PCs)
	with no rationale)	
	3f - Editorial Comments: Includes document corrections or factual information corrections. If we need to identify the document specific comments, we would need to set up “categories” that are specific to the resource or by some categories identified in the coding structure.	27, 28, 29, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, and 115
	3g - Comments that are referring to and/or indicating that they agreed with comments made by other organizations and/or individuals	120
	3h - Management area suggestions that are not identified as Issues	38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, and 86

Table 3. Public Concern Statements and Forest Service Response Ordered by Issues, Alternatives, and Non-Issues/Other Comments

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
ISSUES - 1		
Access		
001	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding access for fire and emergencies:</p> <p>A) Maintain all roads as open and do not decommission them; and</p> <p>B) Construct a fire road on the west side of Marshall Lake in Pend Oreille County.</p>	70, 78
004 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Forest Service road system and access:</p> <p>A) Motorized access is essential for multiple use of the forest;</p> <p>B) Loss of motorized access negatively affects local economies;</p> <p>C) No more road closures;</p> <p>D) Road and trail access is essential for the public’s ability to recreate;</p> <p>E) All alternatives should incorporate increased access to enhance the quality of experiences available to recreational users including day hikes to views, picnic areas, developed campsites, priority trails for river recreation, rock climbing, cross-country skiing, snow shoeing, and continued public/private partnership to accomplish maintenance;</p> <p>F) Appropriate motorized recreational access is currently available on graveled or paved roads and there is no mandate to increase the network with additional off-road driving as it will increase adverse effects;</p> <p>G) There is a need for more motorized access for proper management of all forest resources;</p> <p>H) Limit reductions in access through the use of management zoning;</p> <p>I) Incorporate the following into the development of the road density standards: the aquatic measurable related road density standards from Therrell et 2009, October 24, 2000 Memo for USDI Fish and Wildlife Service; and the 1996 letter prepared by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that discusses human activities including road density measurements when considering listed species impacts available online at http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/Publications/Reference-Documents/upload/matrix_1996.pdf;</p> <p>J) Incorporate road density targets and road management recommendations for desired conditions with an implementation timetable;</p> <p>K) Retain the existing road and trail system (authorized and unauthorized), which provides the number of miles and demand for access by the public;</p>	38, 44, 118, 173, 478, 484, 508, 520, 599, 617, 625, 655, 838, 840
007 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding road and bridge management, maintenance, and decommissioning:</p> <p>A) Public access should not be limited; therefore existing roads should not be decommissioned and the maintenance of them should not be restricted.</p>	834

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
010 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Forest Service trail system and access:</p> <p>A) No changes and/or closure of trails designated for motorcycles, such as do not include the Burch Mt. trail #531 and the Falls Creek drainage in the wilderness expansion;</p> <p>B) Add a discussion of livestock, recreation partnerships, outfitter guides, economic, and social contributions to the trail and recreation category;</p> <p>C) Do not reduce access for pack and/or saddle stock;</p> <p>D) Do not reduce motorized trails, and construct and designate new motorized trails to minimize user conflict.</p>	102, 104, 161, 288, 487, 610, 655, 673
011 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding trail management, maintenance, and decommissioning:</p> <p>A) Decommissioning all unauthorized trails is too restrictive, costly, and will affect many users;</p> <p>B) The goal of decommissioning 10 miles of unauthorized trails annually is too low and they should not be incorporated into the trails system;</p> <p>C) There is no justification for increasing the trail system because costs associated with monitoring, enforcement, and prevention of the proliferation of unauthorized trails are high; and with limited and/or reduced budgets, resource degradation and illegal activity will continue;</p>	450, 484
012 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding unauthorized roads and trails:</p> <p>A) The goal of decommissioning 10 miles of trails is inadequate, the goal should be to decommission all unauthorized routes in conjunction with an annual inventory to set measurable goals for closing any new unauthorized routes within the timeframe of this Forest Plan.</p>	599
013	<p>The Forest Service should consider that any management plan that reduces motorized access further handicaps the disabled and senior citizens, and there is a need for increased handicapped accessible trails and campgrounds.</p>	125, 162, 282, 338, 424, 440, 798, 812
Alternatives		
014 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the development of alternatives for the EIS:</p> <p>A) A full range of alternatives, based on biological capability rather than budget or perceived political or social constraints, for the life of the Forest Plan;</p> <p>B) A Watershed Emphasis Alternative that would be based primarily on the Watershed Condition Framework (WCF) Report with the primary management emphasis of protecting and restoring properly functioning watersheds. It would divide the Forest into the three WCF condition categories with management direction to maintain or improve each of the twelve watershed indicators that were used in the WCF step-one assessment. Climate change impacts on aquatic resources, watershed vulnerability, beaver reintroduction, and riparian area planting should receive careful consideration and be incorporated into management direction.</p>	10, 177
Aquatic and Riparian Systems		
015 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding fisheries:</p>	171, 828, 829

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	A) Consistency with the Washington Governor’s Salmon Recovery Plan Implementation Report recommendations for road management efforts, expansion of stream and watershed restoration, continued monitoring and data sharing, and expansion of implementing the Clean Water Act MOU.	
020 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding roads in key watersheds: A) Provide a thorough analysis supported by scientific rationale for the road density standards, sediment goals related to the road prism, and the amount of constructed stream channel confinement for the key watersheds; B) Impacts from road density from Therrell et al. 2009.	177, 599, 620, 850
022 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding tools to expect for the proposed management actions: A) Incorporate the Watershed Condition Framework completed in August 2011.	620, 868
023 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding watershed integrity: A) Focus protections on Condition 1 watersheds rather than Condition 2 and 3 watersheds because taking a whole watershed approach will help ensure the improvement of these watersheds.	620
Climate Change		
026 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding climate change: A) Incorporate new adaptive management actions at a watershed level as impacts to various resources are identified because climate change is a proven fact and should be used in forest planning (see comment letter 620, comments 118-143); B) Climate change is not a factor and should not be used in forest planning; C) Monitoring and adaptive management will be critical to understanding how strategies are working and if adaptations are needed (Millar et al. 2007, Binder et al. 2009, Spies et al. 2010).	109, 177, 273, 299, 445, 466, 483, 498, 502, 528, 620, 625, 630, 806, 833, 835, 837, 840
Grazing		
033 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding livestock grazing on NFS lands: A) Reducing livestock grazing on NFS lands will have a negative effect on the economy and social aspects of the communities surrounding the Colville and Okanogan-Wenatchee NFs, work collaboratively to meet the needs of everyone; B) Modification of the flexibility and continuity of livestock grazing allotments may become vitally important where the conservation of certain wolf packs and social structure is necessary for the recovery and long-term management of this species within the state; C) Reduce the regulations on grazing and support this community industry; D) Reduce grazing allotments (permits) on the Forest and forestwide AUM’s.	365, 583, 584, 835, 858
034 A	The Forest Service should consider the following effects of grazing on plant community structure and diversity and suggested management solutions: A) Analyze grazing use and its potential influence on fire behavior at the landscape scale, given the wildfire risk reduction	120, 833, 838

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	goals within the Proposed Action; and consider adopting site-specific standards and guidelines to ensure, for example, that grazing does not inhibit the Forest's ability to increase low severity wildfire in dry potential vegetation groups. (A.J. Belsky and D.M. Blumenthal 1997. Effects of Livestock Grazing on Stand Dynamics and Soils in Upland Forests of the Interior West. Conservation Biology Volume 11, Number 2, 315-327).	
035 A	<p>The Forest Service should uphold the clear direction and priority for aquatic resources from INFISH and ACS in the DEIS rather than incorporating the new aquatic strategy (ARCS) because the ARCS weakens protection for aquatic resources and include the following suggestions:</p> <p>A) Replace “providing direction” for proposed grazing plans to “maintain or improve existing (e.g., INFISH) Standards and Guidelines in the Forest Plans to protect riparian areas” in order to maintain current INFISH Standard GM-1 to, “Modify grazing practices (e.g., accessibility of riparian areas to livestock, length of grazing season, stocking levels, timing of grazing, etc.) that retard or prevent attainment of Riparian Management Objectives or are likely to adversely affect inland native fish;</p> <p>B) Establish allowable Riparian Management Objectives that restrict cattle from trampling redds of Threatened or Endangered fish, trampling beaver dams, creating bare soil patches within 100 feet of perennial streams, and suspend grazing if adjusting practices is not effective in meeting Riparian Management Objectives. The rationale is because permittees and Forest managers continue to allow unacceptable impacts to fisheries that need to improve. Compliance standards offer clear standards for riparian management. But the problem is that Forest Service personnel can’t keep up with the burden of maintaining large allotments across the Forest;</p> <p>C) Suspend grazing permits for pastures where management practices have not been effective in meeting Riparian Management Objectives for two years in a row.</p> <p>D) Establish a standard to rest grazing in wildfires for a minimum of two years following a moderate or severe burn because under the Proposed Action for grazing, it states, “Soil disturbance would be managed so degradation of native plant community composition, structure, and productivity is avoided”.</p>	122, 599, 618, 833, 850, 858
036 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider making the changes in their Tools to Expect for Grazing:</p> <p>A) Consider effects on grazing allotments and mitigate any time changes occur that impact those allotments within all management area that have grazing allotments inside their boundary. AUMs need to remain at current levels or be raised to historic levels in all management areas to provide for a reliable grazing program that contributes to the economic viability of our communities.</p>	652
Colville NF – Management Areas		
037 A	The Forest Service should honor the agreements reached at the CNF's "Summit" collaborative process and establish an Active Management Area and a Restoration Zone in lieu of the Management Areas Active Restoration 2 and 3 (AR2/AR3), and include the following: general objectives, criteria for mapping the AMA and RZ, and a management-zone map that reflects the application of the criteria (see comment letter 314, Appendix A). General differences in the AMA/RZ and AR2/AR3) approach	314

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>includes:</p> <p>A) The AMA/RZ approach makes clear distinctions between areas of the Forest in which social objects (fuels reduction, defensible space, commodities production, etc.) would play a key role and areas in which ecological objectives (landscape restoration, habitat restoration, aquatic function, etc.) would play a key role. The AR2/AR3 approach makes no such distinction and the only distinction obvious in the Proposed Action is AR3 is "more intense";</p> <p>B) Desired future average road density is 3 miles in AR3 rather than 2 miles in AR2; the word "important" is not included in habitat language for AR3; and the phrase "limited in scale" is not included in human-caused changes language in AR3. The AMA/RZ approach used existing road density as key criteria in making the distinction between AMA and RZ, while the AR2/AR3 approach used desired future road density as key criteria. Since desired future condition is a subjective human vision unrestrained by current conditions, there is no "on the ground" distinction between the AR2 and AR3 in terms of road density as there is with AMA and RZ. This is a critical difference between the two approaches, because roads are required for timber harvest and fuels reduction purposes and they are counter to restoration objectives; the AR2/AR3 approach fails to incorporate this important consideration;</p> <p>C) There are no timelines or obliteration targets for achieving the desired future road densities in AR2 and AR3, which places the AR2/AR3 approach yet another step further from a real-world proposal. The AMA/RZ approach provides enormous potential for moving beyond project-by-project controversy over what the purpose-and-need and related actions should be on one portion of the Forest versus another. The virtually non-existent distinction between AR2 and AR3 in terms of vegetation management offers no such potential;</p> <p>D) The AMA/RZ approach provides certainty for advocates of commodities production that a portion of the CNF will have a land-management objective that reflects their interests and values, while providing certainty for advocates of restoration that a portion of the CNF will have a land-management objective that reflects their interests and values. According to page 48 of the Proposed Action, the AR2/AR3 approach will "use timber harvest as a tool of active management;" however this language does not provide the degree of certainty for local mills as does an Active Management Area with clearly collaborated and defined objectives and boundary lines. The AMA/RZ approach answers the "why here, why now" question at the landscape scale, providing exponentially increased certainty that projects will move forward without challenge and litigation. This, in turn, ensures advocates of restoration that the infrastructure needed for restoration work (particularly thinning of forest stands overstocked due to fire suppression and other management actions) will remain viable—a win/win equation; and</p> <p>E) The AMA/RZ approach will result (already resulted) in more acres treated annually than the Proposed Action suggests will be treated. The AMA/RZ approach is coupled with AMA prescriptions that have been tested and proven through several years of collaboration with the CNF, while the Proposed Action presents no such detail regarding the prescriptive approach to be taken in the AR2/AR3 approach, nor does it have any history of collaborative success (see comment letter 314 for details).</p>	
038 A	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Active Restoration 2 (AR2) and/or Active Restoration 3 (AR3) MAs on the Colville National Forest:	58, 192, 280, 303, 408, 437, 484, 604, 620, 784

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>A) Protect all the core roadless areas as wilderness to prevent further ecological damage by changing the proposed direction of allowing up to 2 or 3 miles per square mile of roads in AR2/AR3. Considering AR2/AR3 comprises about 3/4 of the CNF, hard standards that limit roads and better yet require large-scale road decommissioning must be developed;</p> <p>B) Define what types of uses will be less intensive than in AR3 but more intensive than in Backcountry and Backcountry Motorized management areas, as described in the PA; and define if this projects will be open to public review;</p> <p>C) Maintain the AR2/AR3 designation (allows motorized winter use) for: 1) Kings Lake Area, 2) not prohibiting motorized winter use in part of the Backcountry area designated as "Pau-Pac", and 3) Ninebark, Flodelle-Tacoma, North Fork of Chewelah Creek, and Old Dominion areas, because these areas are important for the snowmobiling community in Usk, Priest Lake, Chewelah, Colville, Lone, and both sides of SR 20;</p> <p>D) Maintain winter thermal cover in the Eastern Okanogan and Western Colville National Forests at the top 1/3 of site potential, maintain old growth stands at a minimum width of at least 400 feet, maintain connectivity between old growth stands and adjacent forests by maintaining adjacent forests at a minimum canopy density in the top 1/3 of site potential, and do not log any old growth stands; all based on the 1989 Okanogan Plan and Eastside Screens;</p> <p>E) Recommend no addition of active restoration plans 2 and 3;</p> <p>F) Consider a buffer area around the wildlife refuge in Forest Lands with similar habitat retention goals; and</p> <p>G) Ensure all alternatives meet the existing direction for road density desired future conditions for the reserve network acreage to be one mile per square mile; and one action alternative reduces the road density desired future conditions for the proposed AR2 and AR3 to be one mile per square mile for AR2 and two miles per square mile for AR3; and</p> <p>H) Decrease the amount of NFS land allocated to AR2 and/or AR3 because recreational access is diminished with so much land allocated to these MAs.</p>	
039	The Forest Service should consider that all roadless areas should be specifically designated as a Backcountry (non-motorized) MA on the Colville National Forest, with clear protection, and motorized vehicles should not be allowed in the backcountry.	213, 402, 431
040 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Backcountry Motorized MA on the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) By allowing motorized use in this management area, the "high quality, semi-primitive" experience allocation is not correct;</p> <p>B) Allow motorized mixed use from the camping/unloading area to the trails (Trail Numbers 109 and 98). On the east side of trail number 109 allow mixed use on Forest road 9565822 and 9565800 down to 9565000 then westerly on the 9565000 back to the 2030000 and the designated camping/unloading area because this would allow for an attractive backcountry motorized experience in an area already designated for this purpose;</p> <p>C) Change all of the backcountry area designations to non-motorized backcountry and do not allow snowmobile use because this will protect backcountry winter sports and wildlife;</p> <p>D) Honor the agreements from the "Summit" and do not allow snowmobile use in Backcountry. Clarify the description in the Proposed Action that indicates that motorized use could be authorized, but it is not clear whether the authorized use would</p>	484, 585, 618, 678

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	be limited to existing use, or whether new uses could be authorized under the revised forest plan because as written it also isn't consistent with the Summit agreements.	
041 A	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Riparian MA on the Colville National Forest: A) Do not allow any off-road vehicle use within Riparian Management Areas (RMAs) because of bank damage, reduction in water quality, and/or reduction in shade over the stream caused by this activity.	484, 858
044 A	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Special Interest Areas (SIAs) MA on the Colville National Forest: A) Clarify if the Quartzite cliffs overlooking Chewelah (section 17-18 of T 32 N, R 40) is being designated as a SIA because there is concern of the extensive use on the unauthorized trail leading from the Mud lake side to the cliff overlook; B) Do not allow off-road vehicle use in SIAs because this use/abuse negates the purpose of establishing SIAs; C) Do not add ten new SIAs as proposed because it reduces access, unless the use creates excessive erosion.	55, 125, 484
045 A	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) MA on the Colville National Forest: A) Change the statement regarding wild and scenic eligibility in the Proposed Action for the Kettle River because the Kettle River is not a candidate for consideration as a wild and scenic river, based on the Kettle River Policy Plan (KRPP) developed in 1991, in which the Kettle River was adjudicated as non-navigable. In addition, Ferry and Stevens County in support of the Kettle River Advisory Board (KRAB) have maintained all the aspects of the KRPP; B) Do not allow off-highway vehicle use in the riparian areas of eligible wild and scenic rivers as the Proposed Action acknowledges the degradation that has occurred in riparian areas due to unauthorized driving routes and dispersed camping.	484, 790, 813
046 A	The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) on the Colville National Forest: A) Add additional rivers if they are found to be eligible for wild and scenic river designation, as in the example of Sullivan Creek which should be further analyzed because of its outstandingly remarkable recreation, fisheries, and other values.	573, 598, 630
047 A	The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to the management and/or allocation of the Wilderness Congressionally Designated MA on the Colville National Forest: A) Do not add further regulations on activities that are allowed within Wilderness; B) Add more Wilderness on the Colville National Forest as areas provide important refuge areas for wildlife, yet still allow for primitive backcountry hunting and wildlife viewing experiences.	125, 484, 858
048 A	The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on the Colville National Forest: A) Do not allow motorized vehicle use (ORV/ATV/4WD) and/or mountain bikes in these areas;	219, 221, 229, 308, 314, 335, 343, 344, 345, 347, 384,426, 432, 449, 463,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>B) Honor the collaborative agreements reached at the "Summit" regarding "maintaining wilderness character" when it comes to no road construction, timber harvest, or mining allowed in the IRAs (Roadless Area Conservation Rule), do not allow snowmobile use in these areas, and no distinction was made between IRAs and PWAs at the Summit so none should be made in this MA;</p> <p>C) All IRAs should be recommended for wilderness because these areas include low elevation habitats that most wilderness areas do not, and alleviate crowding, illegal trail development, and damage to riparian areas;</p> <p>D) Do not recommend wilderness designation in the Buffer Zone, especially in the Bald Snow and White Mountain areas, as opposed by the Colville Tribes because of 1) increased wildfire and disease threat to contiguous forests and communities on the Colville Reservation; 2) impairment of the Tribes' ability to fully utilize the Tribal Forest Protection Act; 3) impairment of the Tribes' reserved rights; 4) impairment of access to sacred sites and culturally significant areas in the North Half; and 5) impairment of tribal law enforcement in the North Half. Potentially some areas of Bald Snow may be designated as Backcountry but further discussions with the Tribe are necessary;</p> <p>E) Include the following language (or some derivation) to protect the Tribes' interests for any recommended wilderness within the North Half of the Colville and Okanogan NFs but outside the Buffer Zone (Abercrombie-Hooknose, Profanity, and Hoodoo): "The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation has significant cultural and legal interests in an area known as the North Half, which includes significant portions of the Colville and Okanogan National Forests. The Colville Tribes and its members possess reserved rights in the North Half that were ratified by Congress long before the Wilderness Act became law in 1964. The 1891 Agreement reserved to the Colville Tribes and its members several important rights to the North Half, including, among others, the express reservation in Article 6 to hunt and fish throughout the North Half, which rights "shall not be taken away or in anywise abridged." In addition to these expressed rights, the Colville Tribes also enjoy gathering and other appurtenant rights under the 1891 Agreement. The Colville Tribes have also identified at least 386 sites of spiritual and cultural significance to the Tribes and its members that are located on all tracts of Forest Service land in the North Half. Accordingly, given the unique nature of the Colville Tribes' reserved rights, the Forest Service recommends that the Committees of jurisdiction include provisions that affirmatively protect the ability of the Colville Tribes and its members to access designated areas for hunting, fishing, gathering, and law enforcement purposes in any legislation that is intended to designate the enclosed recommendations as new wilderness. The Forest Service further recommends that the committees of jurisdiction also include provisions in any legislation to implement the enclosed recommendations that will affirmatively preserve the ability of the Colville Tribes and its members to access these areas."</p> <p>F) Do not allow vegetation management in recommended wilderness;</p> <p>G) Maintain roadless areas as roadless whether they have been inventoried or not, any current use should be stopped or prohibited, trails closed, and the landscape restored;</p> <p>H) Allow mountain biking in recommended wilderness and reevaluate the Kettle Crest North and South, Taylor Ridge, Midnight Ridge, Old Stage, Barnaby Butte, Edd's Mountain, and Stickpin areas to designate as a non-motorized Recreation</p>	<p>464, 465, 475, 484, 490, 493, 501, 521, 522, 523, 539, 542, 551, 576, 582, 600, 609, 613, 615, 618, 620, 621, 632, 675, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 684, 707, 708, 750, 784, 813, 840</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	Special Interest Area to ensure long-term mountain bike access and the benefits of bicycle tourism for these rural communities.	
049	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to snowmobiling in the Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) The availability of snowmobile areas is dwindling in size therefore creating overcrowding in the available areas, such as in the Proposed Wilderness Areas around the Scatter Creek area where the two snowparks (29 Pines and Salmon la Sac) are already taxed to capacity in the winter with a significant number of users accessing an area that is already too small to accommodate the numbers of users. In addition, if you move the boundary to a less specific gray area, that will only increase the (accidental) incursions into the wilderness; and</p> <p>B) Do not recommend the Falls Creek area of the Northern Chewuch area for wilderness because snowmobiling has been a use for many years in that area.</p>	18, 502
050 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider recommending less or no more Wilderness (Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR)) areas on the Colville National Forest because:</p> <p>A) Allow present recreation use to continue 3 miles in from the Boulder/Deer summit trailhead to the Taylor Ridge trail and other trails heading off the crest in the Kettle/Crest wilderness and maintain the Sherman Loop to the cabin and the Jungle Hill Loop as not recommended for wilderness to allow for mountain biking; however also remove the Kettle Crest trail from Boulder Pass south to the junction of the Taylor Ridge trail from recommended wilderness to allow for mountain biking as well;</p> <p>B) Do not recommend the Kettle Crest for Wilderness because this area does not meet the wilderness criteria for designation and needs to be managed (thinning the lodgepole pine).</p>	175, 469, 678, 817
051 A	The Forest Service should consider recommending more Wilderness (Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR)) areas on the Colville National Forest.	35, 144, 155, 181, 208, 210, 212, 214, 215, 217, 218, 237, 239, 240, 256, 367, 373, 376, 406, 408, 411, 427, 429, 442, 498, 594, 854
Okanogan-Wenatchee NF – Management Areas		
054 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Active Restoration 2 (AR2) and/or Active Restoration 3 (AR3) MAs on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Develop priorities for management in AR2 with the first priority being to restore wildlife habitat, with an accompanying standard to maintain or decrease road density over time; and use a population-dependent method (Wildland Planning Zone map of TWS) of prioritizing fuel reduction; however an even better population-dependent WUI planning zone could be</p>	533, 599, 618, 620, 625, 699

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>designed in Okanogan County, where Tonasket Ranger District fuel planners have used the Okanogan County parcel map to determine the location of lot improvements;</p> <p>B) Rewrite the AR2/AR3 objectives to guide future road rightsizing and use road density thresholds as a planning tool as this measure is a widely recognized and cost-effective means of assessing road impacts. Delete references to meaningless numbers such as “average road density” that attempt to hide true road density by dividing it over a large, irregularly shaped HUC5 watershed. Establish the current baseline condition for monitoring road density changes over time. Monitor open road density changes whenever Plans or projects significantly affect the road density, including this Plan and use an automated system to do this, such as ArcGIS Model Builder. To determine aquatic impacts of roads, use a proximity analysis, such as the number of road miles within 0.1 mile of a stream, including all Maintenance Level 1-5 roads and bare soil areas that may deliver sediment to fisheries (refer to the Problem Roads Analysis submitted by Conservation Northwest for Travel Management Planning and see comment letter 618 Appendix);</p> <p>C) Concerned that AR2 and AR3 is intended to eliminate all Late Successional Reserves (LSRs) in the proposed action. On the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, about 60% of the 30 LSRs are within IRAs and the remaining areas in the developed portions of the forest and AR2 and AR3 designations would overturn what has been a fixed reserve network that any citizen can locate on the ground into a vague “anything goes” prescription for extensive logging and new road construction;</p> <p>D) Consider that MA AR2 is too restrictive to allow aggressive ecosystem restoration - AR3 is preferred for the Entiat Valley; and need to consider wildfire suppression needs and evacuation routes when assessing travel routes and roads;</p> <p>E) Change the location of AR3 MAs and add additional management zones, such as AR1, that allows for wildlife corridors, changing climate trends, and provides low-intensity management in the Eastern Okanogan NF because Conservation Northwest analyzed the management zones of the Eastern Okanogan based on whether areas were IRAs or other unroaded areas, whether there was habitat for lynx and other management indicator species, and whether lands were within a 1.5-mile WUI zone; and</p> <p>F) Reduce the road density standards in AR3 to 2 miles of road per square mile and AR2 to 1 mile of road per square mile; and</p> <p>G) Ensure all alternatives meet the existing direction for road density desired future conditions for the reserve network acreage to be one mile per square mile; and one action alternative reduces the road density desired future conditions for the proposed AR2 and AR3 to be one mile per square mile for AR2 and two miles per square mile for AR3.</p>	
056 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Backcountry Non-Motorized MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Remove this MA designation for the area north of Conconully because it’s difficult to access other than by mechanical or motorized uses;</p> <p>B) Reopen the Corral Butte short road in this MA to OHV travel because the users share the trail and there is no need to designate as Backcountry Non-Motorized;</p> <p>C) Remove this MA designation for the Smarty Creek trail from Road 39 south of 30 mile meadows (trail #371) to north of 20</p>	112, 297, 300, 307, 308, 320, 329, 335, 336, 342, 343, 344, 345, 347, 353, 379, 384, 385, 434, 463, 464, 465, 475, 480, 483, 486, 502, 504, 521, 522, 523, 542, 551, 576, 582,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>mile meadows because there is poor vehicle access, a lack of non-motorized use on this trail, and the snowmobilers maintain the trail because it's a popular trail for them in the winter, thus no reason for this MA designation;</p> <p>D) Remove this MA designation for the land adjacent to the Liberty Woodlands PD and all the way down to Wolf Creek (Township 35 North, Range 20 East, Sections 5, 8 and 9) in the Methow Valley (Tonasket Ranger District) because intensive management of the fuels (thinning by mechanical means) needs to occur to prevent a major wildfire in the area; this designation would prevent this vegetation management from occurring (received many comment letters from landowners in this area);</p> <p>E) Add this MA Designation to the section SW of the Entiat River Road in the Entiat-Chelan IRA as Backcountry Non-Motorized;</p> <p>F) Clarify the wording "vegetation management activities could continue to be authorized" in this MA; however to ensure that the values for which these areas are designated will be retained, much more restrictive guidance is needed, and "All Backcountry and Backcountry-Motorized areas must be removed from the commercial timber base and not included in computations of the Allowable Sale Quantity of timber"; no commercial logging should be conducted, and no roads should be constructed (which is in concern with the RACR). The only type of salvage logging that should be allowed is when it is needed to facilitate road access, and it should be limited to within 200 feet of open roads (see comment letter #620 for more details);</p> <p>G) Revise the management for this MA because it is too restrictive to allow aggressive ecosystem restoration;</p> <p>H) Consider that by allowing snowmobile use and not summer motorized use in this MA, trail maintenance work would be prohibited, would increase the cost, and does not fit the principles of Multiple-Use;</p> <p>I) Ensure snowmobiling is still allowed in the Tiffanies even though it is designated Backcountry Non-Motorized;</p> <p>J) Designate the following IRAs to this MA (Backcountry) instead of the MA in parentheses: Corral Butte (AR-2), Lamb Butte (AR-2), Fawn Peak (AR-2), Granite Mountain (Backcountry Motorized), South Ridge/Beaver (AR-2), Lookout Mountain (Backcountry Motorized), McClure Mountain (AR-2), Gold Ridge (AR-2), Hunter Mountain (AR-2), Hungry Ridge (AR-2 and Backcountry Motorized), Sawtooth (Backcountry Motorized), Grade Creek (AR-2 and Backcountry Motorized), and Black Canyon (Backcountry Motorized) (see comment letter #618 for attached map). The Forest produces a Travel Planning Map each year showing area and road closures. The Travel Plan should not be a stand-alone document but needs to be tied to the Forest Plan; and</p> <p>K) Remove this MA designation for the Bonaparte Mountain Trail 306 because it's a popular summer motorized route to the Bonaparte Fire Lookout and there should be no difference between a dual-sport motorcycle and an ATV.</p>	<p>600, 603, 606, 618, 620, 632, 647, 648, 677, 678, 679, 681, 699, 707, 708, 730, 751, 753, 782, 786, 788, 888, 889</p>
057 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Backcountry Motorized MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Consider reducing the amount of acres allocated to this MA and consider creating new quality motorized vehicle experiences outside of recommended wilderness and roadless areas because "overall OHV use is not one of the more significant uses" on the Forest (per Therrell 2009, p 24), such as Bethel Ridge, Lion Rock, the Teanaway trail system, Hungry</p>	<p>177, 484, 488,</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>Ridge, Granite Mountain, Lookout Mountain, Mt Bonaparte, and Goat Rocks (as noted in Therrell 2009). Specific to the Teanaway Potential Area, clarify, through consultation with motorized and non-motorized users (including mountain bikers), where motorized and non-motorized zones are drawn within the Special Use Area. For the areas that remain in this MA, the Forest Plan must be clear that the motorized trails in this allocation are not to increase, so as to maintain the quality of the backcountry experience that is desired by the motorized users. This is necessary even more so in areas such as the Manastash where the motorized use is clearly at capacity (Therrell 2009);</p> <p>B) By allowing motorized use in this MA, the "high quality, semi-primitive" experience allocation is not correct and allowing off-road driving for 'challenging, thrilling, exciting and entertaining' recreation on public lands is not acceptable, and is destructive by its very nature;</p> <p>C) Redesignate the following areas to Backcountry Non-Motorized: Lion Rock, Mt. Lillian, Red Hill, and Mission Creek because they duplicate the use on the Colockum State Wildlife Area and essentially surround the towns of Cashmere and Wenatchee with year-round motorized use areas. In addition, Clara Lake, Beehive reservoir, and Horse lake Mountain area are a heavily used non-motorized area, important deer winter range, and provide an elk corridor at its higher elevations in the Clara Lake area and should also be Backcountry Non-Motorized.</p>	
059 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Snoqualmie Pass Adaptive MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Maintain the commitment to management for late successional forest habitat in this AMA and ensure that the portion of this MA that extends into the West Fork of the Teanaway, which is shown in the FPR Proposal as SIA, adheres to the guidance in this MA along with the special recreational management goals associated with this SIA;</p> <p>B) Amend this MA to reflect the significant investments by the Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to provide hydrologic and terrestrial habitat connectivity in the I-90 Snoqualmie Pass East Project. For 5-miles north and south of the I-90 Project management of access, recreation, and vegetation should be considerate to the impacts on the functionality and approach to wildlife crossing structures and other connectivity investments;</p> <p>C) Add Sections 5 & 6 in T20N, R13E, to this MA designation, which are contiguous and provide critical connectivity habitat for wildlife; and</p> <p>D) Develop a wildlife connectivity zone, which would add emphasis for wildlife habitat to insure connectivity, especially near crossings of roads and highways, such as along I-90, which would be an overlay on this MA, plus additional lands near Big Creek/Easton Ridge (at least 3 miles either side of I-90 from Snoqualmie Pass to the Cle Elum River bridge.</p>	595, 599, 611, 620
062 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Nationally Designated Trails MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Maintain the proposal for allowing mountain bike use on the non-Wilderness portions of the PNWNST as long as they don't enter the Wilderness; and do not recommend the Kettle Crest North and South Trail for wilderness because it will prohibit mountain bike use on this trail, which is a regional treasure;</p>	70, 609, 620

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>B) On the PCT, protect and restore a natural unroaded corridor at least a half mile on either side of the trail between Snoqualmie Pass and Naches Pass, by removing roads in the corridor (and beyond the corridor to achieve this and other purposes) except for the roads crossing the key passes (Pyramid, Green, Tacoma, Stampede, and Windy), the powerline access roads, and Snoqualmie Ski Area. In addition, revise the management direction to improve the natural character for the corridor;</p> <p>C) Allow all types of travel in this MA designation.</p>	
063 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Research Natural Areas (RNAs) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Do not include the Maple Mountain Research Area in this MA because it doesn't meet the criteria for a RNA;</p> <p>B) Do not include vegetation management as an option for authorized uses in this MA; and</p> <p>C) Do not limit or eliminate motorized user access in this MA because one-third of the Forest is already available for research and education and/or to maintain biological diversity.</p>	483, 502, 620, 655
065 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Special Interest Areas (SIAs) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Maintain the original botanical area within Tumwater SIA as a botanical emphasis not recreational because of the <i>Lewisia tweedyi</i> (even though it's not considered particularly rare anymore) and the federally listed <i>Hackelia venusta</i> that does occur there; do not change the original management direction for this SIA;</p> <p>B) Include the Stevens Pass Historic District that extends from Deception Creek (on the MBS) to Henry Creek near Arrowhead Mountain in this MA;</p> <p>C) Designate more or expand the existing SIAs specifically for rock climbing; such as Icicle Creek Canyon (reopen the road to the trailhead at Black Pine too), portions of Snow Creek Canyon, Outer Space, Givler's Dome, Regular Route on Careno Crag, Pearly Gates, Tieton River drainage, Nason Ridge, Liberty Bell, Early Winters Creek and Cedar Creek. In addition, clarify if Tumwater Canyon SIA has a rock climbing purpose and if Nason Ridge proposed creation emphasis includes a rock climbing purpose (see comment letter #383 Appendix, #774);</p> <p>D) Do not allow any off-road driving in SIAs;</p> <p>E) Remove this MA designation for the Teanaway SIA and recommend it for wilderness; and adopt a forward-looking management strategy designed to avoid complete displacement of non-motorized use, which could emphasize seasonal or other temporary closure to cut down wear and tear rather than reconstruction/reengineering of the trail system to a substantially more developed character. In addition consider adding the following areas to this SIA: Scatter, Fortune, Boulder, Negro, Stafford, and Bear Creeks (see comment letter #595 for details);</p> <p>F) Do not decrease resource protection or increase resource damaging activities in the SIAs, in fact existing prescriptions should be tightened in order to minimize timber cutting, road-building, mining (either commercial or hobby mining), grazing, and unnecessary, excessive motorized use or other activities that would degrade the values for which these lands were</p>	37, 177, 355, 383, 484, 584, 595, 620

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>designated (see comment letter #620); G) Follow the management direction as outlines in the Alpine Lakes Area Land Management Plan Selected Alternative from the FEIS, 1981 for Tumwater Scenic SIA, Teanaway Recreation SIA, Tumwater Botanical SIA, Nason Ridge Recreation SIA, and Annette Lake Recreation SIA because it's important to provide habitat resiliency in a world where the climate continues to alter wildlife migration patterns.</p>	
066 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest: A) Include the Teanaway River in the list of eligible rivers for WSR designation; B) Remove this MA designation for the following rivers: 1) American River because it doesn't fit the description for WSR by the FSH (State Route 410 runs parallel and crosses the river in several places); if remains as a WSR should be "recreational" and currently it's only color coded as (see Table (82.3 Exhibit 01) in comment letter #460); 2) Deep Creek; and the 3) Mad River because it has a diversion near the headwaters that creates Miner's Creek in the Wenatchee River basin, and Mad and Entiat River because of impaired water quality and are on Washington State's 303(d) list (see comment letter #699); C) Do not include the following rivers in your proposal for this MA: Little Wenatchee River, Mad River, Nason Creek, and Raging and Rock Creeks because WSR designation requires a minimum of one-quarter mile wide buffers on both sides of the waterbody and this could affect use on nearby private property; and new road construction is not authorized and there's a need for river access at the Snow Creek on Icicle Creek and Tumwater Campground on the Wenatchee River; D) Maintain this MA designation for the following rivers: Deep Creek, Indian Creek, Rock Creek, and the South Fork Tieton River because they are essential to the conservation of bull trout and support the four largest local populations of bull trout on this Forest; E) Ensure the following rivers are designated as a WSR MA: Cedar Creek, Early Winters Creek, Icicle Creek, Cle Elum, Tumwater Canyon (Wenatchee River), Entiat, Methow, Teanaway Basin (including tributaries of Bear, Stafford, Jack and Jungle Creeks), Cooper, Little Wenatchee, Tieton, Bumping, Nason, Sullivan, Chewuch, American, Waptus, and Chiwawa because they are valuable to the whitewater and kayaker recreationists from all over the world, protect the resources, protect ESA species, and they meet the requirements and offer outstandingly remarkable values (see comment letters #573, 587 & 598).</p>	<p>80, 177, 183, 278, 299, 460, 470, 473, 476, 499, 507, 520, 533, 550, 573, 583, 584, 587, 595, 598, 599, 620, 686, 699, 839, 850, 857</p>
068 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest: A) Hold more collaboration meetings and consult with user groups to discuss uses allowed in recommended wilderness because there are priority areas for mountain bike use and other uses where a clear rationale and need exists for uses not compatible with wilderness designation to be continued. Remove the following PWAs from recommended wilderness: Teanaway, Manastash, Entiat-Chelan, Nason Ridge, Stormy Mountain, Sawtooth, Liberty Bell, and Granite Mountain PWAs because of priority trails for mountain bikers;</p>	<p>45, 97, 177, 271, 276, 287, 298, 315, 326, 383, 392, 412, 483, 484, 485, 502, 533, 538, 540, 560, 584, 591, 595, 598, 599, 620, 692, 699, 755, 781</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>B) Manage all recommended wilderness and IRAs as wilderness to protect the wilderness character of these areas and ensure incompatibles uses are not allowed, such as motorized and mechanized travel; and ensure you include Alpine Lakes Adjacent IRA (in Alpine Lake Adjacent PARW, Alpine Lakes PARW, WSA, Backcountry), Teanaway IRA (in SIA, PARW, WSA, Backcountry, Backcountry-Motorized), Thorp Mountain IRA (in AMA), Nason Ridge IRA (in SIA, Backcountry, Backcountry-Motorized); and a large portion of the I-90 Wilderness Study Area (see comment letter #595);</p> <p>C) Recommend all IRAs for wilderness because these areas include low elevation habitats that most wilderness areas do not, and alleviate crowding, illegal trail development, and damage to riparian areas;</p> <p>D) Do not allow motorized off-road vehicle use (ORV/ATV/4WD) in these areas;</p> <p>E) Close the following IRAs to off-road motorized vehicle use: Entiat (or Sugarloaf Peak), Stormy Mountain, North Navarre Peak (or Grade Creek), Manastash, Taneum, and Quartz (or Lookout Mountain, Frost Mountain, and Bald Mountain) because the current off-road driving in these areas will make them ineligible for future Wilderness designation unless this is acknowledged and prohibited;</p> <p>F) Close the following IRAs to off-road motorized vehicle use: Jackson Creek, Bodie, Clackamas, and Bonaparte Mountain because these areas are islands or stepping stones for wildlife movements across northern Washington to the Cascades in an otherwise heavily altered part of the Okanogan NF;</p> <p>G) Close the following areas to off-road motorized vehicle use: Golden Meadows, Jumpoff Meadows, Lion Rock IRA, and Devil's Gulch (or Red Hill and Lillian Mountain) IRA;</p> <p>H) Clarify and also change the designation for the NE corner of the Clackamas roadless area because the maps show this area open to motorized vehicle use but is recommended for wilderness; rather change it to the A designation Backcountry Non-Motorized because it is more appropriate for the terrain, existing use, and current state of the trail system;</p> <p>I) Change the management direction for this MA because it is too restrictive to allow for aggressive ecosystem restoration;</p> <p>J) Add Blowout Mountain back to the inventory of IRAs on this Forest as this area was deleted in 2006, due to the presence of private lands and some of these lands have now been acquired by the FS; and in addition add the Manastash area (Blazed Ridge) and Negro Creek to the IRA inventory (see comment letter #620 attached map);</p> <p>K) Adjust the boundary for recommended wilderness to allow for high-value climbing opportunities (use of a power drill to establish anchors for ascent and descent) in the following areas: Naches Ranger District: Proposed Preliminary Administratively Recommended Wilderness expansion of Goat Rocks Wilderness on the north slope of Pinegrass Ridge, to the extent it includes a cliff area (the North Fork Cliff) at the approximate coordinates of 46°36'39.63"N 121°17'54.52"W to 46°36'40.13"N 121°17'41.12" W. Tumwater Canyon – new proposal across river from highway at Jolanda Lake found at: 47 37 36.63N, 120 43 33.58 W. Icicle Creek Canyon – New proposal found at: 47 31 48.02 N, 120 44 34.42 W (see comment letter #383).</p> <p>L) Recommend the IRA surrounding the existing Bumping Lake as an addition to the William O. Douglas Wilderness area because the forested shoreline around the existing Bumping Lake represents an excellent low elevation hiking and</p>	

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>recreational opportunity to view large areas of ancient forest, areas that would be destroyed by the construction of any Bumping Lake expansion; M) Do not include the area around Bumping Lake into the William O. Douglas Wilderness area.</p>	
069 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to winter motorized use (snowmobiling) in the Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest: A) Do not limit snowmobiling in this MA because the availability of snowmobile areas is dwindling in size therefore creating overcrowding, such as in the PWAs around the Scatter Creek area where the two snowparks (29 Pines and Salmon le Sac) are already taxed to capacity in the winter with a significant number of users accessing an area that is already too small to accommodate the numbers of users. In addition, if you move the boundary to a less specific gray area, that will only increase the (accidental) incursions into the wilderness; B) Do not allow snowmobile use in this MA even though it's an existing use because snowmobiles degrade the wilderness character; C) Do not limit snowmobiling in these areas and do not designate as this MA: Scatter Creek; Van Epps; Lake Ann; Gallager; Longs Pass; West of Blewett Pass off of the old Blewett Pass road; Scotty Creek; Fortune Creek; Eldorado Creek; Beverly Creek; Stafford Creek; 20-Mile Meadows; 30-Mile Meadows; Parachute Meadows; area north of Conconully in the Okanogan Valley; Manastash Ridge; Blue Slide area; Divide Ridge; Bethel Ridge; and Miller Peak because of the economic impact to surrounding communities, it doesn't impact the resources or wildlife, and it's a very popular recreational activity; D) Do not limit snowmobiling in this MA because it is the 2nd most popular activity as of 2005 and is expected to increase by 350% in coming year; E) Do not limit snowmobile access in this MA because there is little evidence of snowmobile trespass in Wilderness and getting less over time (see comment letter #43); F) Do not include Tiffany mountain and Meadow areas north of Conconully in this MA designation as it will remove 2/3 of the snowmobiling opportunities in the Tonasket Ranger District.</p>	<p>7, 11, 12, 19, 23, 26, 33, 43, 43, 45, 52, 89, 96, 101, 107, 121, 150, 151, 154, 156, 188, 191, 327, 375, 412, 517, 548, 566, 572, 595, 620, 641, 655, 661, 667, 676, 692</p>
070 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider recommending less or no more Wilderness (Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR)) areas on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest because/and: A) Maintain the Backcountry designation for the Proposed Pasayten Wilderness because there are already eight Wilderness areas in the state of Washington, and there is a need for vegetation restoration in this area; B) Remove this MA designation and/or move the boundary for the: Falls Creek area; Teanaway area; 20-Mile Meadows to North Twenty Mile Peak through Thunder Mountain and 2006 tripod burns; and Little Naches (section 8 and 9 at the west end of trail 952 Fifes Ridge); Ravens Roost trail #951 (boundary doesn't extend North or West past the towers and summer to ensure mountain bike access); area directly east of Chiwawa River road because it will close numerous mountain biking trails; Irongate Trailhead; and Long Draw area; C) Do not move wilderness boundaries for ease of management, such as in the Pinegrass Ridge area following the western</p>	<p>19, 39, 64, 90, 96, 120, 308, 335, 343, 344, 345, 347, 350, 378, 384, 463, 464, 465, 475, 483, 502, 521, 522, 523, 542, 551, 576, 582, 600, 632, 677, 678, 679, 681, 707, 708</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	ridge line and covering the areas known as Bear Mountain and Goat Rocks (Chimney Rocks at Section 3 Lake) because it would be very difficult to enforce as the existing natural landmarks are already being utilized.	
071 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider recommending more Wilderness (Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR)) areas on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest because/and:</p> <p>A) Include the following in this MA designation: Tiffany, Devil’s Gulch, and Clackamas because it appears that only areas adjacent to existing wilderness were recommended in the Proposed Action, and these three areas should be recommended because of their valuable wilderness characteristics;</p> <p>B) Include the following in this MA designation: Wenatchee Mountains ridge crest from Van Epps Pass to Three Brothers (which encompasses Ingalls Peak, Fortune Peak, Iron Peak, peaks surrounding Bean Creek, Earl Peak, Navaho Peak, Three Brothers and the Wenatchee Mountains Crest from Rd 9716 to the west of Diamond Head across Tronsen Head, Mt.Lillian including down to the Old Ellensburg trail to Mission Peak and on to the Mission Ridge Road including Lake Clara, Mission Peak, and surrounding areas); North Fork Entiat; Pyramid Mountain; Golden horn; Tower Mountain; Snowy Lakes; Cutthroat Pass/Lake; Liberty Bell; Sawtooth IRA; Bumping Lake; Teanaway; Lake Chelan-Sawtooth; Mad River; Pasayten area north of road 39; Heather Lake trail #1526 (first 2 miles); Crow Hill; Graham Mountain; ensure the North Fork Entiat boundary still allows road access to wilderness on the Chiwawa River road (wilderness boundary at least 1000 feet from the existing road); Norse Peak Wilderness except for State Route 410 and the camps along the highway (maps are unclear); Granite Mountain; Clackamas Mountain; Jackson Creek; Bodie Mountain; Crater Mountain and Crater Creek because they abut the Stephen Mather Wilderness; Esmerelda Basin; Blowout; and Icicle Ridge;</p> <p>C) Include roadless areas that are smaller than 5,000 acres to prevent development, commercial logging, and motorized recreation because even though these areas may not be eligible for wilderness, they have unique values that need to be identified and maintained (see comment letter #620 for map); and</p>	<p>4, 27, 32, 50, 79, 83, 87, 109, 112, 128, 152, 155, 157, 177, 206, 274, 283, 285, 299, 313, 340, 460, 484, 485, 498, 528, 533, 568, 569 584, 585, 598, 614, 618, 620, 628, 630, 656, 692, 697, 783, 785, 791, 814, 815, 836, 842, 845, 847, 848, 849, 850, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887</p>
073	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Wilderness Study Area (WSA) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Maintain the WSA designations and continue to study these areas for Wilderness, such as Lake Ann and Upper Fortune Creek; and</p> <p>B) Include the following in this MA designation: Area east of Navaho Peak which includes Miller Peak.</p>	<p>276</p>
074	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Study Area (ALWSA) on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Allow winter motorized use in the Alpine Lakes WSA;</p> <p>B) Include the entire Alpine Lakes WSA as a PARW (recommended wilderness), including the Lake Ann, Van Epps Pass, and Polallie Ridge areas because these areas were left out of PARW due to increased motorized use (primarily snowmobiles); however if the report directed by Congress in 2000 had been completed, the issue of extensive snowmobile use would not have occurred, thus qualifying this area for recommended Wilderness;</p>	<p>146, 155, 484, 583, 595, 620, 655</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>C) Remove the entire ALWSA from WSA and recommended wilderness designations and allocate to a different MA that allows for multiple-use management, and access for snowmobiling and mountain biking; and</p> <p>D) Develop a special land allocation for managed lands adjacent to I-90 to: protect wildlife crossings and this investment; protect connectivity investments (Connectivity Emphasis Areas – CEAs) as identified in the SPAMA and the I-90 DEIS; clarify WNFPP regarding standards and guidelines for interstate highways; develop an action plan to reduce road densities; improve USFS roads adjacent to ecological connectivity investments proposed by FHWA and WSDOT on I-90 (i.e., FS Road 4832 at Gold Creek); and ensure that all recreational and vegetation management near the wildlife crossings are consistent with the purpose of the structures.</p>	
Both Forests – Management Areas		
075 A	<p>The Forest Service should add a new Management Area or modify Management Areas AR2 and/or AR3 MAs on both Forests to:</p> <p>A) Not use road density constraints of 2-3 miles per square mile to regulate road construction in AR2 and AR3 because these are inadequate for restoration, commodity production, fire suppression, or motorized recreation, and will make prescribed burning and pre-commercial thinning more expensive, in AR2 and AR3 – not all roads are equal; and consider using temporary roads for future management and fire suppression activities under a Class I standard;</p> <p>B) Decommission unneeded roads and convert roads to trails in MA AR2 where “Class 2 Watersheds” exist because the highest priority must be on caring for our watersheds and wildlife habitat; and</p> <p>C) Reduce the road density standards in AR3 to 2 miles of road per square mile and AR2 to 1 mile of road per square mile.</p>	547, 569, 620, 533
077 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Backcountry MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Add a Management Area for “Backcountry Non-Motorized” to balance recreation with the “Backcountry Motorized” MA or clarify that the “Backcountry” MA is for non-motorized summer recreation; and do not allow snowmobile use in this area;</p> <p>B) Open this MA to all users, motorized, non-motorized, and mechanized year-round, don’t create de facto Wilderness;</p> <p>C) Allow winter motorized (snowmobile) use in this MA;</p> <p>D) Management direction in this MA is too restrictive, we don’t need backcountry non-motorized areas.</p>	50, 70, 73, 111, 129, 284, 358, 372, 383, 483, 488, 489, 502, 546, 599, 623, 628, 655, 676, 814, 838, 842, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856
078 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Backcountry Motorized MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Do not change any Backcountry Motorized MA allocations to Backcountry Non-Motorized MA allocations because it would reduce access for all visitors and emergency rescues;</p> <p>B) Reduce the amount of areas allocated to Backcountry Motorized vehicle use; AND</p> <p>C) Confine winter motorized use (snowmobiles) to this MA and do not allow snowmobiles in the Backcountry Non-Motorized MA.</p>	284, 536, 598

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
079 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Riparian MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Use the 1989 Wenatchee Forest Plan for science-based riparian reserve widths because it reflects on-the-ground east-side conditions and the Northwest Forest Plan was quite clear that its riparian areas were designed for west-side conditions and had little science to back them;</p> <p>B) Change management direction for RMAs to address the following: 1) measure distance as horizontal-distance, not in slope-distance; 2) use measured widths to define the riparian management areas (delete “description” column in Table 11 of the PA); 3) use site potential tree height or 100 feet for horizontal distance on unstable areas from the edge of the area of instability; and 4) design activities within these areas that meet state water quality standards because summer motorized OHV use and winter motorized use (snowmobiles) can be very detrimental to stream channels and habitat.</p>	699, 850
080 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the National Scenic Area MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Include motorized single track opportunities in this MA because motorized winter travel (snowmobiles) is allowed, and by creating trails in this MA motorized recreation would be dispersed and reduce utilization of currently open motorized trails.</p>	673
083	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Special Interest Areas (SIAs) MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Maintain all types of access to SIAs.</p>	597
084 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Consider managing 50% of the WSR additions to provide a boat-free environment in order to minimize recreational impacts on the resource, habitat, wildlife, and the experience of those who enjoy the resource without floating interruptions;</p> <p>B) Reconsider the management direction that proposed protection for one quarter of a mile from either side of the river bank vegetation management is ever-changing and this would pre-determine the outcome of the Forest Plan;</p> <p>C) Provide the strongest possible designation for recommended river segment (e.g. Wild designation for segments within roadless areas; Scenic designations in remote areas of public land where there is little development and the scenery from the river is almost entirely natural), such as the upper Entiat River, most of the Chiwawa and Chewuch Rivers, and the Twisp River above Buttermilk Creek. Recreational river designation should be proposed mostly for river segments that flow through more disturbed and developed areas, such as the lower portion of the Naches River; and</p> <p>D) Do not designate more Scenic Rivers to keep prospectors from following the Mining Laws of 1872.</p>	109, 289, 547, 620, 787, 810
085 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Wilderness Congressionally Designated MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Clarify the direction regarding number of encounters a user should encounter, such as allowable heartbeats or group stock</p>	24, 135, 184, 299, 360, 520

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>numbers for any existing designated Wilderness; and consider increasing the heart beat policy to 16 or more, as it now a family of 4 can't visit or camp with another family;</p> <p>B) The definition of "people seeking solitude" is different for everyone and that a mandatory permit system may have a negative rather than positive social impact.</p>	
086 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Do not allow motorized vehicles in this MA;</p> <p>B) Recommend fewer areas for this MA, it's too restrictive, it's too costly to manage, stop closing areas to motorized vehicle and snowmobile users, and consider the effects on the surrounding communities economy;</p> <p>C) Manage recommended Wilderness just like designated Wilderness to protect the wilderness characteristics and do not allow mountain biking;</p> <p>D) Do not manage recommended Wilderness like designated Wilderness;</p> <p>E) Manage recommended Wilderness just like IRAs where motorized use is prohibited; grazing allotments are prohibited; hunting, fishing, and trapping are prohibited; road construction is prohibited; timber harvest is prohibited; and the goal is to maintain, protect, and restore key ecosystem elements of the forest;</p> <p>F) Prohibit and manage snowmobile use in recommended Wilderness;</p> <p>G) Allow snowmobile use in recommended Wilderness;</p> <p>H) Do not restrict mountain bikes in recommended Wilderness; and if so, then designate these areas as Backcountry Non-Motorized or Backcountry Motorized where mountain biking is or should be allowed; and where possible upgrade or construct more trails for mountain biking;</p> <p>I) Allow traditional use (motorized/mechanized use) in this MA and the concern is once the area is designated Wilderness, this use is no longer allowed, thus creating de facto wilderness with recommended wilderness;</p> <p>J) Allocate more areas for recommended Wilderness, including low elevation Wilderness on both Forests; and</p> <p>K) The public requires more recreational opportunities in undisturbed forest habitats with reduced costs, which would result in less timber harvest.</p>	<p>6, 9, 20, 21, 22, 25, 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, 38, 42, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 57, 59, 62, 64, 66, 69, 70, 80, 84, 85, 86, 92, 96, 97, 98, 103, 107, 108, 109, 114, 115, 117, 123, 125, 140, 145, 148, 158, 159, 160, 163, 164, 165, 168, 169, 173, 177, 180, 186, 192, 195, 199, 205, 269, 271, 277, 279, 280, 295, 296, 301, 305, 306, 312, 318, 319, 321, 322, 324, 328, 337, 343, 351, 352, 354, 357, 358, 362, 368, 369, 382, 384, 386, 388, 393, 394, 395, 396, 398, 432, 441, 462, 468, 478, 481, 482, 483, 488, 491, 498, 502, 508, 509, 510, 512, 515, 521, 522, 524, 525, 526, 527, 530, 533, 534, 537, 541, 542, 544, 549, 556, 559, 560, 569, 574, 577, 584, 598, 599, 600, 609, 612, 620, 625, 628, 630, 632, 634, 638, 645, 655, 656, 658,</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
		663, 664, 669, 673, 674, 676, 677, 679, 681, 685, 691, 704, 706, 726, 727, 729, 750, 754, 755, 787, 790, 810, 812, 814, 820, 835, 838, 839, 842, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 878, 880, 881, 884
Minerals and Mining		
087 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to mining:</p> <p>A) Do not recommend new wilderness areas that are rich in minerals near Metaline Falls on the CNF, particularly areas east of Metaline Falls to the Salmo-Priest National Wilderness and west of Metaline Falls as the Abercrombie Hooknose Wilderness area (See comment letter #293);</p> <p>B) Remove sensitive areas from mineral entry; analyze cumulative effects; include mining as a potential threat to aquatic environments; consider mining impacts on habitat effectiveness and connectivity; remove mining from areas that provide for recreational opportunities; protect SIAS from the impacts of mining; and consider impacts of mining on residents of local communities (see comment letter #364);</p> <p>C) Do not create any additional restrictions on access into any areas that have the potential for discovery of mineral deposits;</p> <p>D) Consider the economic impacts, as well as the environmental impacts, because access to explore for and develop future mineral deposits on NFS lands is crucial to sustaining the rural economies of Okanogan and Ferry Counties (see comment letter #472, 565, and 588);</p> <p>E) Consider that the potential management areas (PMAs) that encompass the Bodie and Clackamas areas could be overly restrictive even in terms of minimal road or other surface impacts that occur as a result exploration or future development (see comment letter #565).</p>	293, 418, 472, 483, 502, 565, 588, 841
Recreation		
123 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding motorized summer ATV and/or single track recreation:</p> <p>A) Preserve existing recreation without expansion;</p> <p>B) Create a mixed motorized use area on the CNF in the now designated semi-primitive motorized Twin Sisters/Mack-King area with camping areas (see comment letter #311);</p> <p>C) Prohibit off-road vehicles;</p> <p>D) Add limitations to the type of motorized vehicles to be used off-road to limit degradation of resources;</p> <p>E) There is too much existing motorized use;</p>	123, 311, 444, 540, 546, 669, 814

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>F) Create a motorized use only area that prohibits non-motorized use; and G) Prohibit motorized use in and/or around Golden Lakes.</p>	
124 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding motorized winter recreation and/or snowmobiling: A) Enhance and/or increase motorized access for snowmobiles; B) Expanding wilderness boundaries compound enforcement issues with illegal use, due to budget constraints; C) Addition of 125,800 acres of PAR Wilderness, and 12,000 acres of WSA will produce economic hardship on local communities as it will reduce and/or concentrate snowmobile access and/or use that generates substantial revenue; D) Provide distinct balanced management allocations areas for winter motorized and non-motorized use that will minimize user conflict with timeframes for development in all alternatives; E) No net loss of snowmobile trails and/or areas; F) Currently there is ample snowmobile areas and/or trails; G) Do not restrict snowmobile access to the Lake Ann and Gallagher areas; H) Create a motorized use only area that prohibits non-motorized use; I) Prohibit and/or limit snowmobile use; and J) Disclose where ungroomed snowmobile trails are referenced.</p>	<p>8, 9, 33, 41, 45, 105, 106, 177, 180, 187, 268, 272, 273, 286, 348, 461, 477, 502, 503, 512, 513, 514, 529, 531, 536, 537, 564, 567, 570, 616, 626, 627, 631, 629, 637, 639, 640, 642, 643, 644, 646, 649, 650, 651, 654, 655, 657, 661, 662, 663, 665, 666, 668, 669, 670, 671, 682, 689, 695, 705, 785, 839, 860, 862, 864</p>
125 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding non-motorized summer recreation: A) Prohibit mountain bike use in natural areas; B) Protect, enhance, and/or increase non-motorized use areas and/or trails; C) Enhance and/or increase areas and/or trails for mountain bike access; and D) No further expansion of non-motorized areas and/or trails.</p>	<p>15, 65, 123, 209, 247, 435, 467, 523, 528, 532, 542, 546, 586, 609, 614, 628, 630, 674, 690, 726, 787, 837, 839, 873</p>
126 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding non-motorized winter recreation: A) Designate less areas for non-motorized winter recreation; B) Develop a diverse and equitable use plan that includes the five new non-motorized winter recreation areas that will include areas in the I-90 corridor, Teanaway IRA, east side of Blewitt Pass/Highway 97, the Wenatchee Mountains area, and Clara Lake (Squilchuck); C) Enhance and/or increase areas and/or trails exclusively for non-motorized winter recreation; D) Prohibit motorized use on the Devil's Spur trail on Mission Ridge; E) Designate a Backcountry Non-Motorized MA; F) Permit the development of a Destination Ski Area in the Stormy Mountain area; G) Do not add more wilderness and/or backcountry designations to achieve the goal of adding five new non-motorized areas; H) Maintain current distribution of uses.</p>	<p>20, 80, 84, 109, 123, 134, 157, 170, 177, 284, 286, 346, 356, 380, 435, 436, 488, 489, 505, 513, 553, 598, 620, 655, 664, 723, 724, 837, 839</p>
130 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding tools to expect and/or proposed management actions for</p>	<p>278</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	recreation: A) Create a National Recreation Area similar to the one in Idaho.	
Renewable Forest Products		
134 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding firewood: A) Eliminating areas and/or access for gathering produces hardships.	118
135 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding salvage: A) Disclose when timber salvage is appropriate, when it is not, how it will be determined, and how the public will be involved.	177, 326, 599, 840
Scenery		
140 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding scenery: A) Add active management of soundscape with reasonable limits on sound generation; B) Soundscape management is subjective to the person(s) expectation.	595, 620, 655, 685
Social and Economics		
143 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding social effects: A) Provide estimates for future population growth and relate that growth to land management decisions.	620
Vegetative Systems		
152 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding old growth: A) Continue restrictions on cutting trees greater than 21 inches dbh until the historic range of variability, the larger tree component, and abundance of large woody debris have been restored; B) Provide an action alternative that maintains the current network and/or prohibits harvest of old growth; C) There is no scientific justification for eliminating reserves with their protective standards and guidelines; therefore it can't be adopted as it is contradictory to best available science; D) Provide two action alternatives - one with maintenance of the reserve system and one without to allow comparison of what actions are hindered by maintaining reserves; E) Retain the survey and manage components of the Northwest Forest Plan; F) Manage all reserves to meet the goal of attaining less than one mile per square mile road density.	314, 569, 575, 598, 599, 611, 618, 620, 630, 684, 685, 690, 754
Wildlife Habitats		
156 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding bighorn sheep: A) Separation between domestic species is required to ensure long-term viability and prevent the risk of disease transmission, such as complete geographical separation within the bighorn sheep herd range and/or a buffer between the areas where bighorn sheep are known to frequent and the grazing allotments on NFS lands.	850, 858

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
157 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Canada lynx:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Disclose where recreational activities will be restricted, reduced, or displaced for protection of the lynx; B) Assess how to increase habitat and species resiliency from impacts of climate change; C) Incorporate a regional scale evaluation of habitat connectivity that will provide insights into potentially important habitat connections. 	502, 850, 858
159 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the gray wolf:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Modification of the flexibility and continuity of livestock grazing allotments may become vitally important where the conservation of certain wolf packs and social structure is necessary for the recovery and long-term management of this species within the state. 	858
161 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding grizzly bear recovery for the North Cascades ecosystem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Retain core areas at higher levels than 70 percent; B) Priorities should reflect the needs of local communities to the extent that planning may increase human wildlife conflict; C) Utilize grizzly bear connectivity modeling included within the report - Landscape Permeability for large carnivores in Washington by Singleton et al. 	528, 583, 599, 620
164 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding wildlife habitat connectivity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Ensure wildlife habitat connectivity to sustain population diversity; B) Include guidance on how to manage NFS land adjacent and in the approach zone to current and future wildlife crossing structures built by the Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) on highways that intersect important connectivity areas; C) Identify and provide clear, quantifiable benchmarks (at a watershed or finer scale) to facilitate evaluation and measurement of progress toward maintenance and restoration of habitat connectivity during the life of the Forest Plan. 	130, 625
165 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the spotted owl:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Provide the scientific basis, including data and analyses, supporting the proposition that management across the landscape using the historical and future range of variability to determine habitat amounts and arrangements will conserve it and its viability; K) Disclose how the transition from reserve-based owl habitat to a shifting mosaic will occur and how monitoring of the habitat and species through time will occur. 	543, 599, 850,
166	<p>The Forest Service should address the lack of snags due to illegal firewood cutting and establish a minimum standard for snag retention to maintain suitable habitat for avian species of concern.</p>	302, 723
167 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding tools to expect and/or management actions for wildlife:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Emphasize habitat effectiveness with regard to roads. 	484
168 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding wolverines:</p>	599

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>A) Provide a connected landscape at high elevations allowing for wolverine movements not only where they currently exist but throughout the forest where they are likely to recover during the life of the Forest Plan;</p> <p>B) Address summer and winter recreation and access to be in balance with wolverine habitat conservation and connectivity across the forest, in Special Use Permit areas, and including seasonal closures and protection of den sites.</p>	
169 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding woodland caribou:</p> <p>A) Retain current management as documented in Caribou Habitat Management Guidelines, Appendix 1 FEIS of the 1988 Colville National Forest Plan;</p> <p>B) Disclose how the CNF will ensure that caribou are not adversely affected by snowmobiles; and the number of enforcement staff that will be active on each district during the winter months to monitor woodland caribou;</p> <p>C) Prohibit creating openings larger than five acres in the green tree canopy; and</p> <p>D) Provide seasonal habitat components with well connected, large blocks of late-successional and old forest with large and old trees that provide essential habitat.</p>	437, 484, 675, 858
170 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding wildlife:</p> <p>A) Focus on establishing limits on livestock grazing that will maintain bird habitat quality;</p> <p>B) Adopt the beaver as one of the focal species;</p> <p>C) Disclose whether winter range management from the current Forest Plan will be included;</p> <p>D) Disclose if a management area for species such as woodpeckers and pine martins will be included and if management guidance will change.</p>	302, 569, 625
ALTERNATIVES - 2		
Access		
004 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Forest Service road system and access:</p> <p>A) Include all alternatives the explicit need to reduce the amount of roads to meet the goal of a safe, reliable, sustainable, and affordable road network that does not impact resources;</p> <p>B) All alternatives should incorporate increased access to enhance the quality of experiences available to recreational users including day hikes to views, picnic areas, developed campsites, priority trails for river recreation, rock climbing, cross-country skiing, snow shoeing, and continued public/private partnership to accomplish maintenance;</p>	80, 114, 177, 299, 362, 438, 584, 595, 599, 605, 620, 839, 840
007 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding road and bridge management, maintenance, and decommissioning:</p> <p>A) All alternatives should specify that roads leading to trailheads will be kept open and maintained; prioritize roads that threaten aquatic resource to preserve long-term non-motorized access; roads leading to trails for day hikes should be maintained at Maintenance Level 3 standards; and assess spur roads that are no longer used for either conversion to non-motorized trails or fully decommissioned;</p>	628

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
011 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding trail management, maintenance, and decommissioning:</p> <p>A) Alternatives should address the reduction of trail maintenance backlog and focus on areas close to population centers;</p>	599, 628
Alternatives		
014	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the development of alternatives for the EIS:</p> <p>A) A full range of alternatives, based on biological capability rather than budget or perceived political or social constraints, for the life of the Forest Plan;</p> <p>B) Alternatives that include a variety of recreational and commodity production that demonstrate a positive cash flow to offset social expenditures;</p> <p>C) Clearly describe all management activities, disclose metrics which quantify the comparative effects of the activities, ensure legibility of management areas on the maps, and include a qualitative description of the desired future condition;</p> <p>D) Develop a Restoration Alternative that is not based solely on the lack of disturbance from fire exclusion, but one that integrates the effects of harvest and planting activities, road development, stream channelization, private in-holdings, wildlife management practices, and trail development. It should differentiate between areas that will require management intervention from those where allowing natural disturbance cycles to proceed will ensure ecosystem function;</p> <p>E) The Conservation Community Alternative that reflects a proposal crafted over decades by members of the conservation community and presented during this comment period by the Sierra Club, North Cascades Conservation Council, and the Alpine Lakes Protection Society;</p> <p>F) A Watershed Emphasis Alternative that would be based primarily on the Watershed Condition Framework (WCF) Report with the primary management emphasis of protecting and restoring properly functioning watersheds. It would divide the Forest into the three WCF condition categories with management direction to maintain or improve each of the twelve watershed indicators that were used in the WCF step-one assessment. Climate change impacts on aquatic resources, watershed vulnerability, beaver reintroduction, and riparian area planting should receive careful consideration and be incorporated into management direction;</p> <p>G) A Sustainable Recreation Alternative that would encourage a connection to nature in a variety of way for people of different interests and skills; conserve and respect our natural, historic, and cultural heritage; and promote enjoyable and safe recreation;</p> <p>H) An alternative that would exclude mineral rich areas from the following management areas: backcountry, backcountry motorized, national scenic areas, nationally designated trails, riparian, scenic byways, wild and scenic rivers, research natural areas, wilderness, proposed wilderness, wilderness study areas, administrative, and recreation sites;</p> <p>I) An alternative that would increase non-motorized trails for mountain bike use, allow it in proposed wilderness areas, and/or prevent a net loss of non-motorized trails for mountain bike use;</p> <p>J) Alternatives that mimic the 1988 Forest Plan and/or a no action alternative;</p> <p>K) An alternative that analyzes the ability of NFS Lands to retain snowpack and the potential impacts from climate change;</p>	<p>10, 62, 80, 109, 155, 171, 177, 284, 293, 294, 302, 308, 311, 314, 326, 335, 343, 344, 345, 347, 364, 384, 390, 392, 437, 463, 464, 465, 475, 479, 488, 490, 501, 521, 522, 523, 533, 542, 547, 551, 568, 569, 575, 576, 582, 584, 590, 595, 598, 599, 600, 618, 620, 625, 628, 632, 636, 677, 678, 679, 681, 683, 685, 707, 708, 781, 791, 829, 833, 839, 840, 850</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>L) An alternative that proposes adding all remaining roadless areas and/or preliminary administratively recommended wilderness areas and/or wilderness study areas to the National Wilderness System;</p> <p>M) An alternative that includes managing NFS Lands within the Yakima River Basin to help return in-stream flows to their historic levels throughout the year by limiting tree cutting and increasing snowpack retention;</p> <p>N) An alternative that manages the NFS Lands as critical area for all listed, or proposed for listing, threatened or endangered species;</p> <p>O) An alternative that includes active management to reduce insect infestations, disease, fire damage, and increase the ability for firewood gathering with a goal of 80-125 MMBF of timber harvest per year;</p> <p>P) An alternative that includes livestock grazing of sheep, goats, horses, and cattle;</p> <p>Q) An alternative that designates at least five or more new non-motorized winter recreation areas for the next 15 years (see specifics in letter 595, comment 30);</p> <p>R) An alternative that would increase the amount of unauthorized routes to be decommissioned annually;</p> <p>S) An alternative that would: retain old growth protections and connectivity specified in the Northwest Forest Plan and Eastside Screens; preserve standards as opposed to desired conditions in objectives for aquatic and riparian systems and/or improve them; monitor to validate efficacy and resilience to climate change; continue of survey and manage of species; minimize road density with specific targets for road decommissioning; not allow new roads or commercial timber harvest in all IRA/PWAs; develop a defined spectrum of limits for speed, emissions and sound intensity for snowmobiles; recognize the Stevens Pass Historic District, acquire non-federal lands in the Alpine Lake area, and analyze winter recreation uses;</p> <p>T) The Sierra Club Coalition Wilderness Proposal (see comment letter 620, comments 153-155,160; and maps in Attachments 4 and 5); which includes the following: An alternative that addresses the ecological values of wilderness and would add under-represented ecoregions and landforms to the wilderness recommendation in the PA, plus IRAs with high and moderate benefits to focal species. Such an alternative would include all or parts of 20 IRAs identified in the Draft Wilderness Assessment (Table 54, p. 81) as having significant areas of vegetation and landforms not currently well-represented in the National Wilderness Preservation System: Abercrombie-Hooknose; Salmo-Priest Adjacent; Bald-Snow; Cougar Mountain; Profanity; Jackson Creek; Liberty Bell; Pasayten Rim; Long Swamp; Black Canyon; Granite Mountain; Sawtooth; Entiat-Chelan; Teanaway; Alpine Lakes Adjacent; Manastash; Black Canyon; Stormy Mountain; Slide Ridge; and Bethel Ridge;</p> <p>U) An alternative that provides family-oriented recreational opportunities such as campgrounds, viewpoints, day hikes and interpretive opportunities;</p> <p>V) An alternative that takes an active role in restoration and management that would enhance recreational uses, and maximize vegetation and habitat manipulation to accomplish restoration goals and encourage development of human necessities which the forest provides;</p> <p>W) A full range of alternatives that would increase and/or enhance motorized and non-motorized recreation and access; and</p> <p>X) An alternative that considers effects on adjacent landowners and managers, such as shared responsibilities for endangered</p>	

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>species management; intermingled and shared responsibility for access systems; intermingled ownership patterns; the Forest's long-term strategy for land exchanges and acquisitions; forest and shrub steppe restoration; wildfire protection and management; forest insects and diseases; watershed function including water quality as well as quantity; and livestock grazing.</p> <p>Y) The Forest Service should reconsider retaining the Late-Successional Reserves (LSRs) on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest and the Eastside Screens on the Colville National Forest because/and/or:</p> <p>Z) To prevent logging across these huge areas and protect old growth;</p> <p>AA) Explain the intention to continue to adhere to the requirements of the Eastside Screens;</p> <p>BB) Protection for harvesting >21" dbh trees is weakened;</p> <p>CC) If removed, replace with an 'equivalent or better strategy' for old forest conservation and clear vegetation management guidance;</p> <p>DD) The Eastside Screens were developed from a scientific process and extensively peer reviewed;</p> <p>EE) Maintain connectivity between old growth stands and adjacent forests by maintaining adjacent forests at a minimum canopy density the top 1/3 of site potential (or 50% canopy, which will allow effective fuel thinning), averaged over the extent of the stand within that plant association;</p> <p>FF) The Forest Service should reconsider using the Northwest Forest Plan in regards to old-growth reserve protections, and retain the Late-Successional Reserve system consistent with the newly released Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl and the Eastside Screens to manage old and large tree;</p> <p>GG) Include an inventory of all Survey and Manage species on the Forest and their range;</p> <p>HH) Retain the Aquatic Conservation Strategy;</p> <p>II) Ensure strong protections in this framework of LSRs are carried over for the Alpine Lakes Area (ALA) and the DEIS references the ALA Management Plan with explanation of the interpretation/translation to the proposed management areas; and</p> <p>JJ) The Forest Service should ensure that the aquatic protections in the Revised Forest Plans equal to, or exceed, the combined protections of the Northwest Forest Plan (including the Aquatic Conservation Strategy), INFISH, and PACFISH; and clarify in the DEIS how management direction will coincide between all of these Plans.</p>	
	Aquatic and Riparian Systems	
017 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding other key watersheds in the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) Add the following streams to the list of priority watersheds: San Poil River, Boulder Creek (South and North forks), Little Boulder Creek, Lone Ranch Creek, Tonata Creek, Toroda Creek, Sheep Creek, Lambert Creek, Ninemile Creek, Thirteenmile Creek, O'Brien Creek, Hall Creek, Sherman Creek, Granite Creek, and Scatter Creek and in the analysis, the recreational and habitat values of these streams should be considered not only in isolation, but on a forestwide, regional, and national scale;</p> <p>B) Include two additional watersheds for the Pend Oreille River - the Calispell and Sullivan watersheds because restoration</p>	498, 613

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	activities through the implementation of the Box Canyon Settlement Agreement and the Seattle City Light Settlement Agreement will occur here in the future.	
019 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding other key watersheds on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Add the Teanaway watershed to the list of priority key watersheds;</p> <p>B) Add the Entiat watershed to the list of priority key watersheds;</p> <p>C) Include the following as key watersheds: Rattlesnake Creek, Little Rattlesnake Creek, Rock Creek, Nile Creek, and Milk Creek, within the Naches River watershed, the North Fork Teanaway River, and the upper Taneum Creek watershed because the list of key watersheds where restoration work will take place is very limited and does not include many streams that are important for the recovery of listed anadromous fish and bull trout that require significant restoration due to streams being adjacent to roads in the floodplain and riparian area or undersized water crossing structures.</p>	80, 177, 309, 699, 800, 839, 850
024 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding water quality:</p> <p>A) Alternatives should specify the level of activity and a requirement to take all feasible steps to disconnect drainage from road systems to streams, lakes, and wetlands; and to mitigate sediment inputs in those limited situations where disconnection is not feasible (see comment letter 850, Attachments 2 and 3 for existing and proposed TMDLs);</p> <p>B) Alternatives should include restoration of water quality in wetlands, seeps, and springs, including areas upstream and downstream especially as it pertains to water temperatures, sediment, and water chemistry.</p>	850
Collaboration – Colville		
028 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding their collaborative process on the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) Incorporate the collaborative agreements that were reached by the Northeast Washington Forestry Coalition (NEWFC) and as promised by the Forest Supervisor Rick Brazell into the Proposed Action and EIS;</p> <p>B) Incorporate the collaborative agreements that were reached at the "Summit" process from 2006-2009 co-convened by the Stevens County Commissioners and NEWFC, specifically the IRAs and proposed wilderness recommendations. In addition, the results from the Summit should have been mentioned in the "What We Heard From the Public" section of the Proposed Action (see comment letter 314, Appendix A);</p> <p>C) Incorporate the collaborative agreements that were reached at the "Summit" process from 2006-2009 co-convened by the Stevens County Commissioners and NEWFC; however first verify the agreements on active timber management and restoration zones with the values and concerns.</p>	314, 547, 594, 613, 711, 749, 750, 771
Collaboration – Okanogan-Wenatchee		
029 A	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding their collaborative process on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:	174, 599

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>A) Incorporate comments that were submitted through the Provincial Advisory Committee; and B) Consider a more collaborative process, trusted by all parties that forms a transparent process with understandable decision metrics and detailed presentations for the Wenatchee National Forest.</p>	
Collaboration – Northeast Washington Forestry Coalitions		
096	<p>The Forest Service should consider the “blueprint” proposal from the Northeast Washington Forestry Coalitions (NEWFC) collaborative effort between timber industry, conservation, business, and the Forest Service because it’s a “balanced proposal that has something for everybody” for managing the Colville National Forest, includes three new National Recreation Areas, and was agreed to by the consensus of the public during the Forest Summit meetings.</p>	432, 539, 615, 698, 702
Colville NF – Management Areas		
037	<p>The Forest Service should honor the agreements reached at the CNF's "Summit" collaborative process and establish an Active Management Area and a Restoration Zone in lieu of the Management Areas Active Restoration 2 and 3 (AR2/AR3), and include the following: general objectives, criteria for mapping the AMA and RZ, and a management-zone map that reflects the application of the criteria (see comment letter 314, Appendix A).</p>	314
038 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Active Restoration 2 (AR2) and/or Active Restoration 3 (AR3) MAs on the Colville National Forest: A) Ensure all alternatives meet the existing direction for road density desired future conditions for the reserve network acreage to be one mile per square mile; and one action alternative reduces the road density desired future conditions for the proposed AR2 and AR3 to be one mile per square mile for AR2 and two miles per square mile for AR3.</p>	303
Okanogan-Wenatchee NF – Management Areas		
065 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Special Interest Areas (SIAs) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest: A) Follow the management direction as outlines in the Alpine Lakes Area Land Management Plan Selected Alternative from the FEIS, 1981 for Tumwater Scenic SIA, Teanaway Recreation SIA, Tumwater Botanical SIA, Nason Ridge Recreation SIA, and Annette Lake Recreation SIA because it’s important to provide habitat resiliency in a world where the climate continues to alter wildlife migration patterns.</p>	620
071 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider recommending more Wilderness (Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR)) areas on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest because/and: A) Maintain IRAs as roadless and clearly state this in the DEIS for all alternatives, manage consistent with the RACR, which is no new road construction; no commercial timber harvest; no mining; and maintain, protect, and restore as key ecosystem elements of the Forest.</p>	484, 569, 599, 620, 840
Both Forests – Management Areas		

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
077 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Backcountry MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Allow human-powered recreation (mountain biking) in this MA not only as a substitute to Recommended Wilderness but also as an alternative to some areas of Backcountry Motorized because the experience sought by mountain bikers is very different than motorized users, it's a healthy exercise, has low impact on the environment, and its users learn the importance of nature and a pristine backcountry. Studies have shown that mountain biking is no more destructive to the environment than foot traffic: Dave D. White, M. Troy Waskey, Grant P. Brodehl, and Pamela E. Foti (2006). A Comparative Study of Impacts to Mountain Bike Trails in Five Common Ecological Regions of the Southwestern U.S. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration Volume 24, Number 2, pp. 21-41.</p>	308, 335, 339, 343, 344, 345, 347, 349, 384, 390, 433, 463, 464, 465, 475, 500, 520, 521, 522, 523, 534, 542, 551, 558, 576, 579, 582, 586, 593, 600, 632, 677, 678, 679, 681, 688, 707, 708, 831, 832
086 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Do not implement the Interior Columbia Basin Strategy for this MA because it creates de facto wilderness; violates the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 - Public Law 98-339 - July 8, 1984; and at least three alternatives need to be developed for the "three" forests – do not combine the Okanogan and Wenatchee forests into one Plan because that is also illegal.</p>	437
Wenatchee Mountain Coalition Proposal		
095	<p>The Forest Service should consider the Wenatchee Mountain Coalition Proposal and:</p> <p>A) Adopt the stratification of motorized and non-motorized winter use in the three high priority target areas in their plan;</p> <p>B) Remove snowmobile use on the Wenatchee Mountains crest; and</p> <p>C) Include significant new non-motorized winter recreation areas.</p>	170, 286, 391, 489, 506, 532, 553, 623
Recreation		
124 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding motorized winter recreation and/or snowmobiling:</p> <p>A) Provide distinct balanced management allocations areas for winter motorized and non-motorized use that will minimize user conflict with timeframes for development in all alternatives.</p>	461
126 B	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding non-motorized winter recreation:</p> <p>A) Analyze cross-country skiing as an alternative to motorized recreation.</p>	326
Renewable Forest Products		
137 A	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the allowable sale quantity (ASQ) for timber:</p> <p>A) Increase the ASQ (70-90 MBF) to include insect salvage and biomass to maintain forest health, reduce overstocking, and compliment and/or support the continuation and growth of natural resource industries;</p>	365, 440, 482, 508, 565, 584, 594, 613, 617, 652, 659, 678, 781, 798

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	B) Reduce the ASQ to reduce habitat fragmentation, soil damage, degradation of water quality, and other resource damage.	
Vegetation Systems		
152 B	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding old growth: A) Utilize NEWFC guidance for Objectives and Broad Guidance for the NEWFC Active Management Area and NEWFC Restoration Area and note that thinning is limited to dry forest (see comment letter #314).	314
Wildlife Habitats		
164 B	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding wildlife habitat connectivity: A) I-90 wildlife connectivity zone use and/or management.	611, 620, 857
NON-ISSUES AND OTHER COMMENTS (3A – 3H)		
Already Decided by Law, Regulation, or Policy (3a)		
025	The Forest Service should ensure that best available science (new information) considers the state of the nation and future funding.	838
030	The Forest Service should extend the comment period for the Proposed Action.	46, 66, 423,
031	The Forest Service should coordinate with local government and other federal and state agencies in development of the Forest Plan and: A) Incorporate the Entiat (WRIA 46) Watershed Plan led by the Entiat Watershed Planning Unit, endorsed by the Forest Supervisor, and because the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board and NOAA Fisheries have adopted local watershed plans; B) Ensure coordination with the County Agencies (local government) located within the Colville and the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests and incorporate information from their County Plans into the Forest Plan (i.e., Ferry County Comprehensive Plan) (see comment letters 545 attachments, 813, and 835), otherwise it's a violation of Federal Land Policy Management Act and the NFMA; C) Currently, the Proposed Action violates the 1982 Planning Rule because the area south and west of Wenatchee is left open to year-round motorized use (BCMA and BC) and the agency must adhere to the 1982 Planning Rule which states: 219.1(b)(9) coordination with the land and resource planning efforts of other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and Indian tribes; and section 219.21(3)(e) formulation and evaluation of alternatives under paragraphs c) and d) of this section shall be coordinated to the extent feasible with present and proposed recreation activities of local and State land use or outdoor recreation plans, particularly the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), and the recreation opportunities already present and available on other public and private lands, with the aim of reducing duplication in meeting recreation demands; D) Continue coordination with the National Park Service to provide services across agency boundaries;	62, 309, 439, 488, 528, 545, 583, 699, 781, 790, 800, 813, 834, 835, 858

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>E) Encourage stronger collaboration between the Wenatchee River Ranger District and Chelan County Natural Resource Department to develop mutually-beneficial salmon recovery projects in the key watersheds of Peshastin and Nason Creeks;</p> <p>F) Coordinate with Bureau of Reclamation because of its investigation of fish passage at its existing dams within the Yakima River Basin;</p> <p>G) Acknowledge the partnership between the Forest Service and Pend Oreille Lead Entity (POLE), which has led to state and tribal government partnerships, and incorporate fish restoration projects into the Proposed Actions from these partnerships; and</p> <p>H) Ensure consultation with County Commissioners in the current process of revising their Comprehensive Plan.</p>	
092	The Forest Service should ensure continued access to and maintenance of the right-of-way utility corridors owned by PUD because they are essential as they are the linkage to provide service to the general population.	363, 622
113	The Forest Service should consider its mission is custodial management because resource management goals cannot be accomplished due to anticipated inadequate budgets and the Final Plan should be within the scope of the potential budgetary restraints.	62, 547
114	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding multiple-use management of NFS Lands:</p> <p>A) Multiple-use management is the purpose for which the Forest Service was created;</p> <p>B) It provides recreational opportunities, sustained yield, renewable forest products, mining, proper land use and wildlife management, and it averts user conflicts;</p> <p>C) Areas should not be separated by specific use type; and</p> <p>D) The Proposed Action violates the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act.</p>	270, 299, 358, 437, 483, 502, 601, 602, 617, 789
117	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Planning Rule:</p> <p>A) Revision should be based on the Planning Rule, not the ICBEMP science implementing Landscape Character and Dynamics;</p> <p>B) The Proposed Actions fails to comply with the Planning Rule (see comment letters #488 &598); and</p> <p>C) The Planning Rule has low agency accountability for goals.</p>	437, 488, 569, 598
118	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding laws, regulations, and policies:</p> <p>A) The Proposed Action violates Executive Orders (EO) 11644 and 11989 in that it fails to minimize conflict between winter recreationists (motorized and non-motorized);</p> <p>B) The Forest Service is legally obligated to maintain a quality recreation experience for non-motorized users;</p> <p>C) The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit concluded, the Forest Service does not have the discretion to ignore the multiple-use mandate to focus solely on environmental and recreational resources. The court specifically held that “the national forests, unlike national parks, are not wholly dedicated to recreational and environmental values.” Cronin v. United States Department of Agriculture, 919 F.2d 439, 444 (7th Cir. 1990);</p> <p>D) The Ninth Circuit has recognized that the legal principal of multiple-use does not mean that timber production must be</p>	488, 547, 575, 588, 598, 620, 636, 813, 835, 846, 850

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>deemphasized (see comment letter #547);</p> <p>E) The Endangered Species Act should not dominate the Forest Planning process because it is a detriment to the multiple-use mandate;</p> <p>F) Production of commodities is no longer an emphasis of agency management; is inconsistent with the needs of the community, the Organic Act, and/or the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act; and does not comply with Regional Forester Wagner's June 29, 2009 letter;</p> <p>G) Eliminating forest reserves and elements of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy is unlawful (see comment letter #575);</p> <p>H) Give equal consideration to the social and economic factors and not presume that environmental harm will outweigh these considerations;</p> <p>I) Do not eliminate the Alpine Lakes Area Management Plan;</p> <p>J) The Proposed Action represents a fundamentally-flawed analysis of the respective roles of program and project-level planning (see comment letter #636);</p> <p>K) Planning should follow Federal law under the Federal Land Management Policy Act, Public Law 94-579 of October 21, 1976, see specifically Title II Section 202(c) (9) of the Act, which stipulates coordination with State and local governments first, then public participation; and</p> <p>L) Include in the Forest Plan, the critical elements of changed conditions that affect what types of management direction and strategic emphasis from the National Fire Plan (2000), Healthy Forests Restoration Act (2003), Federal Land Assistance, Management And Enhancement Act (2009), Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Act (2009), National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy (2011), and Western Bark Beetle Strategy (2011).</p>	
145	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding tribal consultation, rights, and treaties:</p> <p>A) Balance important tribal values with the values of other users to meet statutorily imposed multiple-use objectives;</p> <p>B) Honor Executive Order 13007's approach to protecting sacred sites;</p> <p>C) Continue to include the public in the process of addressing critical issues associated with tribal interests and NFS land management;</p> <p>D) Ensure that the Kalispel Tribe's ability to access and use forest lands consistent with traditional cultural properties and practices is fully supported and recognized;</p> <p>E) Include management actions that would allow suitable Colville Tribes' on-reservation plans;</p> <p>F) Ensure that any existing or future authorities for the Colville Tribes to conduct stewardship or other activities on NFS lands under its Integrated Resource Management Plan will not require an amendment to the Forest Plan;</p> <p>G) Exempt Colville Tribe members from obtaining permits to collect special forest products;</p> <p>H) Conduct consultation with affected tribes consistent with Executive Order 13175; and</p> <p>I) Disclose how tribal input was considered in the Proposed Action.</p>	466, 613, 615, 806, 833, 837
Outside the Scope of the Proposed Action/Irrelevant to Decision To Be Made (3b)		

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
002	The Forest Service should consider that NFS roads should be maintained by landowners if they are used for logging by the landowner.	117
003	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding funding for road and trail maintenance: A) There are insufficient funds and personnel to monitor and/or maintain roads and trails; and B) Assess a user fee on all off-road drivers to aid with the costs associated with engineering, education, monitoring, enforcement, and maintenance.	484
004	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Forest Service road system and access: A) Convert roads that can no longer be maintained due to lack of funding into ATV and single track trails; B) Reduce the road system to improve water quality and wildlife habitat; C) Establish reduced speed limits for ATVs; D) Construct more pull-outs to facilitate picking huckleberries; E) There should be less road development; F) Maintain roads at Maintenance Level 3 standards to trailheads so passenger cars can access the wilderness; G) The road inventory is inaccurate; H) Necessary maintenance and/or upgrades to evacuation routes from Community Wildfire Protection Plans; I) All access routes, including those that are 1.5 miles and longer, should remain open to support availability of a balance of motorized and non-motorized uses, tourism, and economic benefit to local communities; J) Eliminate unused roads and users should be surveyed to determine which roads and trails should be retained and maintained; K) Close and/or decommission roads that are no longer needed and/or are causing environmental damage; L) Open the 38 road from the County road border to Salmon Meadows to ATV use and include a lower speed limit and additional signage; and open roads 37 and 42 for ATV use and to create loop opportunities; M) Open motorized access allows for illegal dumping of trash; N) Open more roads to ATV and non-licensed motorcycles; O) The destruction of trails, limited road access, and the elimination of parking areas have made it difficult and unsafe for stock travel; P) Allow biking on the road and trail south from Boulder Pass to provide access to the high country and the trail down to Bulldog Cabin Road; Q) Coordinate with local governments and/or stakeholders prior to any road building moratorium, closures, and/or decommissioning, which could potentially then lead to limited access, unmanageable areas, or roadless area designation. In addition, all changes in use should go through a public comment period; R) Management of the road system and access should be for the long-term and anticipate future user groups, as well as consider linkages to road system availability;	96, 109, 117, 123, 157, 273, 284, 309, 365, 383, 438, 457, 489, 512, 520, 563, 577, 583, 584, 595, 599, 625, 652, 655, 699, 723, 727, 800, 840, 889

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>S) Design a more developed system of roads and trails that are specialized to specific users, which would enhance the recreational experience and can be developed by contractors within the stewardship or timber sale areas as part of their bid;</p> <p>T) Develop a scientifically substantiated methodology for measuring road density and review it in conjunction with other federal and state agencies. The methodology should include Maintenance Level 1 roads along with roads that carry a hydrological impact on watershed in the density calculation and direction to meet the existing road density goals for area on the Forest as stated in previous documents should be used in concurrence with these new standards for any areas that do not currently have a road density goal or proposed goal;</p> <p>U) Establish a baseline condition from which to monitor and/or measure road density over time;</p> <p>V) Provide scientific proof to substantiate closure of unauthorized roads and trails, which is claimed to ensure the habitat will be free of motorized disturbance;</p> <p>W) Include the Motorized Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) in the DEIS because road definitions can vary and the MVUM defines the road access; and</p> <p>X) Open all gravel roads to ATV/ORV use but ensure vehicle meets regulations and driver is 16 years old.</p>	
005	<p>The Forest Service should consider that the RS2477 roads and trails that have been historically used fall within proposed wilderness and/or restricted areas; and therefore such proposed wilderness areas will need to be reconsidered.</p>	835
006	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Forest Service road system and access:</p> <p>A) Reciprocal investments to correct road system problems and restore watershed health with other land managers is necessary;</p> <p>B) Road densities and the relationship to potential impacts to wintering wildlife;</p> <p>C) Complete the Minimum Roads Analysis and use this Analysis for the Forest Plan Revision and Travel Management to avoid any conflicting direction and combined objectives for shared land management outcomes;</p> <p>D) Management objectives, design standards, and frequency of maintenance for state and private landowner road systems are often different and in many places responsibility for the road systems is shared;</p> <p>E) Maintenance and use issues are being addressed through cost shares designed around actively managing for timber harvest on 135 miles of road easements and/or road control rights located on DNR managed lands, which is no longer the situation. The recreational use has substantially increased on these roads that were never designed for that purpose or volume of traffic resulting in other landowners incurring substantial expense to subsidize these uses or deferring needed road repairs until such time as an equitable cost distribution can be negotiated;</p> <p>F) Road design standards have caused disagreement in achieving an equitable cost distribution;</p> <p>G) Cost Share road systems are typically low on the priority list; however watershed restoration and transportation system objectives related to forest plan direction should also be applicable and enforceable on these road systems;</p> <p>H) Ensure collaboration with adjacent landowners associated with specific measures and timelines occurs to assure commensurate management objectives can be met; and</p>	850

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	I) Decisions resulting from the travel management process should not supersede protective measures of forest plan revision relative to wildlife.	
007	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding road and bridge management, maintenance, and decommissioning:</p> <p>A) Incorporate road improvements between Sand Canyon and the Little Pend Oreille National Wildlife Refuge site with signs to direct people to that location;</p> <p>B) Maintain Forest roads most commonly used, especially those used to access private residences;</p> <p>C) Designate roads that are to be decommissioned as ATV/snowmobile and/or non-motorized trails that do not cost as much to maintain;</p> <p>D) Open roads should allow ATV/OHV access for trail maintenance;</p> <p>E) Reduce road maintenance standards commensurate with reduced budgets;</p> <p>F) Coordinate with volunteer groups and/or permittees to maintain and/or close various routes;</p> <p>G) The monetary affect of timber harvest on road maintenance – more harvest equals more road maintenance money;</p> <p>H) Design the road system commensurate with future budgets, which would include roads needed to assist with administrative needs, resource extraction, and decommissioning and/or restoration activities prioritized accordingly:</p> <p>I) Develop a geospatial inventory of access points along the river to establish which roads should be retained;</p> <p>J) Results of each watershed’s Minimum Roads Analysis should be used as a guide to adjust the size and composition of roads, while setting specific benchmarks within the life of this plan not only on unauthorized routes but on existing routes;</p> <p>K) Prioritize road restoration by including measures of sedimentation and erosion such as number of miles of stream within 200 feet of a road because monitoring requires measurable standards;</p> <p>L) Utilize the map submitted by Conservation Northwest in establishing the right size road system because it highlights roads that have the highest impacts on wildlife and fisheries;</p> <p>M) The existing road system cannot be maintained; therefore it would be imprudent to build more roads to accommodate more users;</p> <p>N) Disclose all costs associated with the road system;</p> <p>O) Decommission roads constructed for timber extraction that are no longer necessary, thus permanently removing them from the system;</p> <p>P) Decommission roads used to access and maintain public utilities or require additional actions;</p> <p>R) Designate roads for restoration to Maintenance Level 3 standards, such as the Chiwawa River Road;</p> <p>S) Exclude roads that are found in IRA/PWA from closure and decommissioning, as they are being used by recreationists;</p> <p>T) Better signage is needed for routes that are closed to motorized use;</p> <p>U) Roads should not be decommissioned because nature will do so; therefore saving the cost to the Forest Service.</p>	<p>58, 73, 117, 483, 502, 528, 547, 569, 587, 599, 618, 620, 622, 625, 630, 655, 712, 724, 817, 838, 857</p>
008	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding road and trail inventory:	287, 618

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>A) Conduct an analysis of unauthorized roads to determine current use and designation as authorized roads; and B) Develop a complete and accurate GIS road layer that includes Maintenance Levels and external non-NFS connecting roads within a one-mile buffer.</p>	
009	<p>The Forest Service should consider an annual monitoring plan with established methodology that uses the current baseline condition and measures road density to ensure that goals are being met for reducing and maintaining the road system to attain the desired condition.</p>	599
010	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Forest Service trail system and access: A) Plan for and construct new mountain bike and/or other non-motorized trails near communities and outside of PWAs; B) Plan for and construct new hiking trails with signage near communities; C) Maintain the low elevation non-motorized designation on the Ferry County Rail Trail; D) Do not designate more trails as non-motorized, as designation would result in concentration and congestion of use; E) Trails within the Wilson Creek Rim, including the Wilson Stock Trail and the Naneum-Wilson Trail, currently provide excellent motorcycle single track use and they are infrequently used by non-motorized users; F) Do not limit ATV trails to 30 miles for the duration of the Forest Plan, instead the number of miles should increase annually within budgetary limits; G) Define "nearby communities and five percent" in the following sentence: "Provide recreation opportunities for nearby communities by locating five percent of the trail system adjacent to communities where practical"; H) Define "some" in the following sentence: "Upgrade or construct some trails to better accommodate mountain bike single-track use"; I) Work with opportunities in the following sentence: "Close and decommission approximately ten miles of user-created routes annually"; J) Define why the Northern half isn't included in the following sentence: "Provide five additional non-motorized settings readily available to non-motorized winter recreationists distributed across the southern half of the Forest"; K) Include planning in the following sentence: "Implement engineering, education, and enforcement actions to manage the appropriate use on the appropriate trail"; L) Define the reference to "off highway" on page 60; M) There are approximately 10 miles of designated ATV trails and approximately 630 miles of non-connected road segments that allow for mixed use; N) Assess impacts from mountain bikes and revise the trail access plan accordingly; O) In the statement of desired future condition, include that rules will be enforced to provide a safe and enjoyable experience for users engaged in legal trail use; P) Collaborate with climbing groups to establish a sustainable system of trails to popular climbing areas that are currently unauthorized (see table attached to original letter 38);</p>	<p>2, 35, 58, 63, 91, 110, 287, 288, 311, 317, 323, 369, 381, 383, 398, 450, 460, 483, 484, 487, 488, 489, 494, 502, 519, 528, 577, 587, 597, 609, 610, 620, 625, 628, 678, 877</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>Q) Reopen trails that were once multiple-use and have been closed;</p> <p>R) Clarify if trails originating on NFS lands that continue on non-NFS lands will require access agreements;</p> <p>S) Evaluate unauthorized trails and those found suitable should be incorporated into the trail system because they serve as access for popular paddling destinations, connections to other trails, extended travel routes, in many cases are the only trails close to communities, and they improve the function of the trail system by providing loop opportunities;</p> <p>T) Develop additional non-motorized trails in the Methow Valley; even though there are a number of mountain bike trails, they are spread out over a wide area and are not concentrated. The Valley is over 50 miles long, rides tend to be short because most trails do not interconnect allowing loop rides, many trails are in higher terrain under snow for much of the mountain bike season, most trails are open to motorbikes that tend to degrade the trail surface for biking, and the trails are often too steep for beginner or intermediate riders to enjoy;</p> <p>U) List the Infra Trail Module in the Forest Plan as a reference;</p> <p>V) Consider trails for all uses and/or upgrade equitably with no one use singled out as more important;</p> <p>W) Disclose if site-specific impact analyses are conducted prior to the construction of trails or if they are approved through a categorical exclusion; and if monitoring of trails is a pre-requisite for establishing the trails with immediate, permanent closure should degradation occur (see photos of degradation to trails 609 and 611 on the Naches Ranger District in Attachment 1 to comment letter 484):</p> <p>X) Combining different types of use on trails creates user conflict;</p> <p>Y) Reopen the motorized trail to Pyramid Peak and build a new trail from the lower Chiwawa Trails to Maverick Saddle;</p> <p>Z) Recommendations under the trail management section reflect an arbitrary and capricious decision by recommending only five new additional non-motorized settings for non-motorized winter recreation to be established over a period of 15 years; therefore disclose the documentation on how this number was chosen, how it was assigned to only the southern half of the Forest, and how these five areas over 15 years will specifically meet its obligations under the Planning Rule and the EIS for non-motorized winter recreationists;</p> <p>AA) Consider the list of 120 possible choices for new and safe non-motorized trails (see Table in letter 488);</p> <p>BB) Consider one-way loop trails in areas where mountain bikers, hikers, and horses share the trails;</p> <p>CC) Consider more than a five percent increase in trails near communities because population and recreational needs are increasing;</p> <p>DD) Develop the Marcus to Marblemount Stage Road remnant into a mixed-use trail;</p> <p>EE) Collaboration with other agencies is necessary and should be initiated to inform users of the joint use and to minimize confusion about differing land management strategies and/or regulations for trails that span jurisdictions such as the Pacific Crest Trail, the Pacific Northwest Trail etc.;</p> <p>FF) Identify trails that will be upgraded and/or constructed to better accommodate mountain bike single-track use;</p> <p>GG) Disclose whether the trails designated for ATV travel will be existing trails or new trails, and if new trails, identify the</p>	

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>planned location of these trails; HH) The target for decommissioning unauthorized routes should be more than one mile per year, and disclose the costs associated for obliteration and enforcement of these closures; MM) Consider impacts from current illegal motorized use when analyzing the impacts from the proposed expansion of the motorized trails system; and II) Developed trails and/or day hikes to viewpoints.</p>	
011	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding trail management, maintenance, and decommissioning: A) Wilderness trail maintenance is more costly per mile than non-wilderness trail maintenance; B) Charge user fees to provide for trail maintenance; C) Use volunteer user groups and/or cooperators for maintenance and/or improvements; D) It is unacceptable to reduce the trail maintenance backlog on 10 to 20 percent of the trails system; E) Disclose the methodology for decommissioning unauthorized trails; F) Develop a policy for incorporating unauthorized trails into the trail system when there are no environmental impacts to do so; G) Considering increasing maintenance by user groups as a desired condition; H) The goal for each of the five areas identified should include 15-25 miles of ski trail suitable for grooming and that additional access to adjacent ungroomed trails in backcountry areas will be provided; I) It is imperative to maintain, expand, and/or upgrade facilities, trails, and trailheads to ensure tourism, which supports the local economies; J) Trails can be maintained for less than it costs to decommission them and maintaining them causes less resource disturbance than reclamation; K) Funding levels at the Ranger District level determine use and maintenance; L) There is no mention of trail management for snowmobiles, horses, or ATVs; M) Implement engineering, education, and enforcement actions to manage the appropriate use; N) Manage seasonal closures and/or opening of motorized trails by on-the-ground evaluation of motorized use by zones (drainages and/or elevation in the spring and autumn versus strict summer use only); and O) Identify non-motorized trails that link NFS lands to the wildland urban interface as a high priority for maintenance and/or development.</p>	64, 114, 199, 268, 288, 323, 450, 496, 502, 606, 609, 655, 673, 724, 727, 838
012	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding unauthorized roads and trails: A) Identify the unauthorized routes to be decommissioned (10 miles per year of trails) by those that are harmful to forest management objectives (fish, wildlife, botanical); B) Consider roads that are to be decommissioned as potential non-motorized routes for hiking and mountain biking; C) Do not consider unauthorized routes for addition into the road and/or trail system; and</p>	586, 620, 655

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	D) Closure of unauthorized routes will introduce the creation of new similar routes to reach specific areas and/or serve as needed.	
093	<p>The Forest Service should address Bumping Lake and the William O. Douglas Wilderness area on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest and:</p> <p>A) Do not enlarge the Bumping Lake dam and address the impacts of doing so because it will flood ancient forest and endangered northern spotted owl and bull trout habitat; and include information regarding the height and diameter of all trees that would be destroyed by the construction (see photos attached to comment letter #591); and</p> <p>B) Include the beneficial environmental impacts of removing the existing Bumping Lake dam in the DEIS.</p> <p>C) The Forest Service should consider that the American Alps Legacy Project will succeed in extending North Cascades National Park east to Early Winters, with an act of Congress, and will need to be included in the Forest Plans because/and/or: Do not designate NCSA/Liberty Bell and Sawtooth IRAs as wilderness or expansion of North Cascades National Park; rather should protect and enhance climbing opportunities at the Washington Pass area (current Liberty Bell and Sawtooth IRAs) with one of the following designations: National Recreation Area (National Park Service-managed); Special Interest Area (Forest Service-managed) with a climbing/mountaineering recreational purpose; and Non-motorized backcountry (Forest Service-managed); and Consider recommending the following areas for addition to the North Cascades National Park: Golden Horn area adjacent to the Park.</p>	278, 298, 315, 326, 383, 392, 538, 561, 591, 620, 781, 820,
094	<p>The Forest Service should address the following in regards to the Travel Management Plans (TMPs) on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Clarify if the management direction in the TMPs will be included in the Forest Plans or vice versa;</p> <p>B) Consider completing the TMPs and the Forest Plans at the same time, and if not, disclose when the TMPs will be completed and incorporated into the Forest Plans;</p> <p>C) Complete a motorized over-snow Travel Management Plan at the same time as the Forest Plan revision process; and</p> <p>D) The Forest Plan provides the guidance to develop the TMPs; therefore should address motorized and non-motorized recreation.</p>	595, 620
121	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding land ownership and/or acquisitions;</p> <p>A) Give high priority for acquisition to private lands within the Pacific Crest Trail corridor;</p> <p>B) Give high priority for acquisition to private lands adjacent to roadless areas;</p> <p>C) Disclose documentation of how development of private lands have altered recreational use patterns; and</p> <p>D) Manage and/or acquire lands within a checkerboard pattern, particularly those lands in the I-90 corridor.</p>	474, 620, 850
Relevant to the Proposed Action and Are To Be Addressed in the Analysis Plan (3d)		
004 C	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Forest Service road system and access:</p> <p>A) Monitoring for road density standard goals should include 1) measurable strategic objectives regarding management of the road network; 2) explicitly defined terms; 3) methodology used and reference associated guidance and direction (e.g., which</p>	840

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>road maintenance levels are included in road density calculations, what is the criteria that must be met for a road to be “effectively closed,” etc.); 4) an implementation schedule; and 5) a Plan for measuring progress and success. The Plan should include the miles of designated roads and trails that are maintained to standard; where unauthorized use is occurring; miles of road decommissioned and/or converted to non-motorized trails; effectiveness of management actions in moving toward achieving its identified minimum necessary road system; which motorized routes are causing considerable adverse effects to environmental or cultural resources; appropriate metrics to reflect water quality at the watershed level; and a description of how the Minimum Roads Analysis, Access and Travel Management Planning, and the Forest Restoration Strategy will work together in a well-integrated way to serve the purpose of meeting these strategic objectives.</p>	
015	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding fisheries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Maintain a strategy to ensure clean water for fisheries and other aquatic life; B) There should not be any restrictions on hatcheries or planting fish because the Forest Service does not manage fish just their habitat; C) Disclose if mid and upper Columbia species are the same; D) Create public awareness of fisheries and/or watershed needs; E) Sustainability considering effects of climate change to habitats and possible changes in fire effects as a risk factor that may influence Forest Plan components adopted to assure sustainability; F) Review BLM plans for fish passage at existing dams; G) Implications of land use designations related to the Yakima Integrated Plan fish and habitat restoration objectives; H) Identify how goals and objectives will be achieved, how success will be measured to achieve compliance with the plan and the Aquatic Conservation Strategy, and the thresholds that will trigger management action to resolve limiting factors in achieving the stated goals with a timeline developed for implementation; I) Disclose how large woody material will be protected or its removal mitigated to ensure compliance with ESA recovery and the Aquatic Conservation Strategy; J) New specific protocols for the construction and replacement of water crossing structures to accommodate not just flow, but passage of ice, alluvium, and large woody material, as well as avoiding adverse impacts to the important function and values of the channel migration zone and geomorphic floodplain so that habitat availability is not reduced; K) A fish habitat improvement project identified in the Entiat Watershed Plan to construct a bridge across the Mad River on the Mad River Trail; L) Include instruction and/or education on how private landowners are to install large woody debris/complexes to restore stream structure, provide habitat, and help wood impoverished streams; and M) Retire grazing allotments in riparian, wetlands, and nearby upland habitats and require intensive management for active restoration. 	62, 142, 270, 288, 309, 392, 699, 800, 850
016	<p>The Forest Service should consider that past restoration projects to improve and/or develop habitat connectivity (following</p>	437

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	ICBEMP science) have failed leaving a wasteland and water that is not flowing freely (see photos in letter 437).	
017	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding other key watersheds in the Colville National Forest: A) Evaluate grazing allotments within key watersheds for closure; and B) At a minimum, maintain current levels of function in non-key watersheds and ensure steps are taken toward restoration in the course of management activities such as vegetative treatments, fuels treatments, and attaining riparian objectives.	613, 625
018	The Forest Service should continue restoration efforts with support from volunteer groups in the Chewuch, Peshastin, and Little Nacheson key watersheds on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest that are being used as models regionally and nationally.	177
019	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding other key watersheds on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest: A) Watershed planning is in conflict with the Entiat Watershed Plan; and the Upper Columbia Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull Trout Recovery Plan because it dramatically increases Entiat WRIA 46's initiating governments' workloads and the results from catastrophic fire will lead to extinction of salmon, steelhead, and bull trout; B) Aquatic and/or geologic disturbances (floods, debris flows, landslides, and earthquakes) are active disturbance agents in the Entiat watershed; C) Provide an analysis of the relationship between the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest and the Yakima River Basin watershed that includes: all streams within the forest that drain into the Yakima River, the riparian condition, the changes from historic instream flows, and the degree of timber management within each stream drainage; D) Develop a longer list of priority watersheds with a list of tier 2 priorities or a link to a prioritized list of key watersheds, should future funding increase or if external funding and partnerships can be developed; E) The Forest Service should consider the Yakima Integrated Plan as some components will be affected by Forest Plan revision, such as the Bumping Lake Enlargement that will involve acquisition of lands and construction of a new dam. This enlargement will help or improve water supply and quality, protect sources of cold water and cold water habitat, provide connectivity to bull trout and/or salmon and steelhead habitat and spawning grounds, and providing additional floodplain restoration opportunities; F) Identify and prioritize for restoration the forest road and water crossing infrastructure that prevents attainment of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy goals and objectives and the range of natural variability of the important physical and biological components of each watershed and the infrastructure that most significantly precludes fish passage and important physical and biological components of each watershed important to salmon, steelhead, and bull trout.	171, 309, 326, 800, 829, 850
020	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding roads in key watersheds: A) Explain the restoration of 109 road acres over the next 15 years and reduction of road-generated sediment on 436 acres, include site-specific information and the rationale for how these sites were determined; and change the measurement of	62, 114, 177, 482, 569, 599, 607, 613, 625, 655, 675, 683, 850, 858

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>acres to miles for better understanding by the public;</p> <p>B) The calculation of road density standards should include Maintenance Level 1 roads for which hydrological functions has not been restored, in conjunction with other criteria that should be established regarding level of hydrological function to guide the inclusion of Maintenance Level roads that have hydrological impacts on the watershed;</p> <p>C) The road density standard should reduce motorized and non-motorized route density in watersheds and riparian areas;</p> <p>D) Monitoring should include: 1) number of miles of the designated roads and trails that are maintained to standard; 2) where unauthorized use is occurring on or off the road and trail system; 3) number of miles of unneeded roads that have been decommissioned or converted to another use; 4) effectiveness of management actions in moving toward achieving the minimum necessary road system; 5) motorized routes that are causing considerable adverse effects to environmental or cultural resources; and 6) appropriate metrics to reflect water quality at the watershed level;</p> <p>E) Stream restoration is a tactic to eliminate roads and access that is not valid as there are other solutions;</p> <p>F) Address the need for roads and trails that will remain part of the system that are to be upgraded to current standards, including fish passage and meeting the state turbidity standard;</p> <p>G) Identify conditions under which existing roads will be relocated outside of the floodplain and riparian areas after road failure in a flood event;</p> <p>H) Key watersheds should include recovery habitats for ESA-listed gray wolves and salmonids; and</p> <p>I) No ORV use allowed in key watersheds and retire grazing allotments in drainages where reproduction and development of species of concern is occurring or has historically occurred.</p>	
021	<p>The Forest Service should address the need for restoration of stream connectivity with floodplains including restoration of off-channel habitats where roads are located within floodplains.</p>	850, 858
022	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding tools to expect for the proposed management actions:</p> <p>A) Acknowledgement of the relationship to the Pend Oreille Lead Entity and FERC;</p> <p>B) Water quality and water quantity are important to agriculture;</p> <p>C) Eliminating the Aquatic Riparian Conservation Strategy violates best available science (see comment letter 575, comments 6 and 7);</p> <p>D) The aquatics strategy should maintain and/or improve the existing plans that are to be merged, because the regional direction provided in the Aquatic Riparian Conservation Strategy weakens the current guidance (see comment letter 599, Attachments D and E);</p> <p>E) Include standards for hydrologic function that can assess both direct measures (validation prior to project implementation) and indirect measures (temperature, substrate, migration barriers, woody debris, and channel confinement);</p> <p>F) Reintroduce beavers to enhance watershed health;</p> <p>G) Based actions on climate change and biological sciences;</p> <p>H) The desired condition should provide for improved forage for livestock;</p>	97, 171, 309, 533, 560, 575, 599, 618, 620, 630, 652, 683, 699, 701, 711, 754, 755, 787, 800, 812, 829, 833, 850, 858

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>I) A low risk approach should protect all watersheds, not just key or priority watershed for restoration; J) Include water as an item under the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act; K) Priorities for restoration should be more site-specific as to where the treatments will occur and how they were identified; L) Incorporate the Aquatic Riparian Conservation Strategy (see comment letter 833, comment 8); and M) Link specific actions to the goals of reduced road-generated sediment by 109 road acres and 436 acres of road prism that will detail how they would be accomplished.</p>	
023	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding watershed integrity: A) Protect water quality and quantity; B) Protect and/or restore watershed integrity by reducing the road network; C) Utilize the latest science, recovery plans, and Interior Columbia Technical Recovery Team data; and D) Grazing allotments requiring uneconomical “improvements” and contributing to watershed degradation should be closed.</p>	62, 167, 182, 438, 863
024	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding water quality: A) Emphasize the value of water quality and setting high standards for maintaining water quality; B) Disclose the methods for collecting site-specific water quality and beneficial use data prior to ground disturbing activities; C) Activities should not cause or cumulatively contribute to excursion of the state water quality standards and it should be a goal for the desired future condition.</p>	10, 109, 141, 326, 599, 833, 850
026	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding climate change: A) Disclose the inventory and monitoring of carbon both above and below ground; B) Include the issues and management recommendations and/or strategies made in the Adaptations to Climate Change: Colville and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests (see comment letter 599, Attachment 1); and C) Increase social and economic resiliency to climate change. The following strategies are intended to reduce impacts of climate change on forest infrastructure that would cause (and, in some cases, already has caused) expensive repairs, temporary closures, etc. These impacts are anticipated due to changes in the hydrologic regimes brought about by climate change. In addition, these strategies are intended to educate forest employees and the public about climate change and provide support for collaborative learning that facilitates adaptive management. Match infrastructure to expected future conditions; Reduce the impacts of roads on water quality, quantity, and flow regimes (Binder et al. 2009); Decouple roads, or remove roads that interrupt hydrologic function (Binder et al. 2009); Relocate roads and other structures that are at risk from increased peak flows (Woodsmith 2008). Promote education and awareness about climate change; Educate employees about climate change science and adaptations (Binder et al. 2009); Proactively engage the public in an education program that increases understanding of the need for adaptation (Binder et al. 2009); Develop educational materials and programs about climate change; Collaborate to implement adaptive management strategies; and A high level of collaboration between research and management will be necessary to integrate evolving science understanding and to design and implement monitoring. Planning across jurisdictional boundaries and collaboration on projects across boundaries will be vital to</p>	109, 498, 569, 599

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	successfully adapting to climate change and creating more resilient forest and human systems (see comment letter #625).	
032	The Forest Service should consider that the preservation of heritage resources is not inconsistent with providing areas for motorized and multiple use.	655
033	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding livestock grazing on NFS lands:</p> <p>A) Consider grazing as a tool for vegetation management and rangeland health;</p> <p>B) Discontinue Forest Plan revision until responsible grazing on NFS lands occurs;</p> <p>C) Increase the areas for more grazing;</p> <p>D) Identify multi-use management objectives for grazing lands that include the incorporation of trails into some grazing allotments which benefit other uses such as hiking, mountain biking etc.;</p> <p>E) Clarify the responsibility of fixing fences, treating invasive weeds, and developing/maintaining watering facilities on these allotments and monitoring of these actions;</p> <p>F) Maintain reasonable management practices that allow the use of motorized tools, pickup trucks, off-road vehicles (ORV), and road use on allotments to develop and maintain the watering facilities, salt stations, fences, and to retrieve entrapped or injured animals as most of these activities cannot be done on foot or horseback;</p> <p>G) Discontinue use of grazing allotments to allow for recovery of grizzly bear and wolf populations because of the interaction between livestock and these wildlife species;</p> <p>H) Discontinue use of grazing allotments because negative impacts to habitats of plants, wildlife, fish, watersheds such as Libby Creek, and watershed function exceed economic benefits; and</p> <p>I) Consider closing grazing allotments for a minimum of two seasons following disturbances such as controlled burns and thinning in conjunction with cattle grazing.</p>	5, 62, 70, 450, 484, 520, 583, 698, 835
034	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following effects of grazing on plant community structure and diversity and suggested management solutions:</p> <p>A) Use the funding from grazing permits to manage the effects of grazing on watersheds, streambanks, vegetation, and plants;</p> <p>B) Remove the overgrazed areas from grazing permits and reduce cattle per acre where the range is depleted, which could also reduce weed spread;</p> <p>C) With the introduction of bighorn sheep on the Wenatchee River Ranger District, the FS needs to expand the sheep allotment onto the unused cattle allotment in Potato Creek to maintain the domestic sheep allotment and reduce fuel loadings and maintain separation, if needed, between wild and domestic sheep;</p> <p>D) Consider the effects of all types of grazing (livestock, sheep, goats, horses, and cattle) on the vegetation, fish, and aquatic and riparian habitat; locate handling facilities out of riparian areas; and monitor and adapt grazing activities accordingly;</p> <p>E) Provide a full assessment and disclose the following information in the DEIS: list of all active grazing permits including the numbers of permits and their AUM capacity, list the permits that have lapsed since 1988, provide the actual AUM's</p>	90, 120, 267, 309, 326, 437, 438, 584, 606, 620, 699, 800, 838

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>consumed, numbers of livestock by specie that have grazed the national forest each year since 1988, location of the permits, and cost of grazing permits;</p> <p>F) Developed water areas for livestock also benefits wildlife; and</p> <p>G) Management of grazing is one tool to accelerate weed management because it's easier to find the weeds in the grazed areas.</p>	
035	<p>The Forest Service should uphold the clear direction and priority for aquatic resources from INFISH and ACS in the DEIS rather than incorporating the new aquatic strategy (ARCS) because the ARCS weakens protection for aquatic resources and include the following suggestions:</p> <p>A) Align the allotment sizes to agency capacity to enforce compliance with policies;</p> <p>B) Restrict livestock grazing to be consistent where management areas are designated habitat for aquatic, plant, and wildlife species or that contributes to opportunities for recreational and road-based plant and wildlife viewing;</p> <p>C) Ensure controlled access to off-stream water supplies, use fencing or other management measures to protect riparian areas, and design water crossings to minimize contamination of water and ensure water quality and listed fish life expectancy;</p> <p>D) Consider the impacts of timing, particularly where high priority aquatic habitat is present, when developing standards and guidelines to meet grazing objectives in riparian areas (M.L. Mcinnis and J.D. Mciver 2009) and (Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. Volume 64 No.6 394-399);</p> <p>E) Adopt the approach for permit relinquishment in the Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan and Final EIS, published by the BLM Prineville District (see comment letter 833, comment 9; and Federal Register: 1114/05, Vol. 70, No. 10 p. 2653-2654);</p> <p>F) Consider the adoption of reserve forage allotments; allotments would not be allocated to one specific grazing operator; LRMP identify overarching guidelines for the use of RFAs and these guidelines should establish what would trigger the use of an RFA, and what would be considered high versus low priority; LRMP identify sideboards for the term of use of an RFA, including ecological thresholds; and provide how the number of permittees able to graze simultaneously would be established, and how forage would be allocated; and</p> <p>G) Consider the influence of grazing intensity on stream temperatures and establish standards and guidelines in those areas that are particularly sensitive to temperature increases (S.B. Maloney, A.R. Tiedemann, D.A. Higgins, T.M. Quigley, and D.B. Marx, 1999; Influence of Stream Characteristics and Grazing Intensity on Stream Temperatures in Eastern Oregon; USDA Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station General Technical Report PNW-GTR-459).</p>	599, 618, 833, 850, 858
036	<p>The Forest Service should consider making the changes in their Tools to Expect for Grazing:</p> <p>A) Ensure funding is available to manage the range program and enforce the requirement to improve or repair fencing, which would keep the livestock out of campgrounds, the boat launch at the lake, and on private property;</p> <p>B) Include the standards and guidelines for grazing management in the DEIS;</p>	62, 178, 625, 652

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	C) Education program for national forest users that choose to recreate where grazing allotments are located.	
087	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to mining:</p> <p>A) Prohibit uranium mining along the Kettle Crest, PNW Trail, Profanity IRA north of Sherman Pass, and in Wilderness and/or recommended Wilderness;</p> <p>B) Prohibit mining on all NFS lands or reduce areas that are open to mineral entry because it's harmful to wildlife, fish, water, and other resources;</p> <p>C) Disclose all known energy resources, including geothermal, oil, natural gas, hydropower, and biomass on the OWNF; and review any proposed regulations regarding hydrologic fracturing (fracking);</p> <p>D) Identify all the mining claims on the OWNF;</p> <p>E) Address mining activities in the DEIS, as it wasn't mentioned in the Proposed Action and mineral development is allowed on NFS land via Federal law; however mineral development has disrupted many of the goods, services, and values in the Buckhorn Mountain area and has the potential for disrupting many activities on NFS land in the Forest Plan area(s);</p> <p>F) Remove "minerals" from the list of "Renewable Forest Products" under "Overview of Challenges" starting on page 16 of the PA, and list it as a separate bulleted topic because minerals can't be considered renewable within a reasonable time period; and address specific challenges and strategies in this new bullet;</p> <p>G) Develop a monitoring and evaluation plan which includes an assessment of whether the mineral exploration or extraction has been implemented in compliance with forest plan direction;</p> <p>H) Acknowledge the need for 401 certifications of operating plans for mines.</p>	126, 136, 142, 196, 197, 206, 214, 215, 231, 235, 252, 254, 326, 364, 368, 369, 401, 420, 426, 472, 552, 563, 584, 620, 653, 684, 690, 702, 718, 719, 765, 766, 803, 805, 819, 821, 826, 850
088	<p>The Forest Service should consider and address the following in regards to a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (M&E) for the Forest Plans on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Need to develop an M&E Plan whether or not management activities have taken place in order to determine whether the management plan or allocation of budgets to manage the resources is appropriate and adequate; and objectives for the future desired conditions have been met;</p> <p>B) Assess and continually monitor populations and trends of all species; monitor to update the baseline information and to determine the degree of success in achieving ecological sustainability; and/or develop contingencies to avoid adverse habitat modifications until population trend monitoring becomes well-established (see comment letter #569);</p> <p>C) Include the Forest Restoration Strategy in the M&E Plan for the OWNF;</p> <p>D) Include this information in the M&E Plan and: Maintain and keep current the baseline information, which includes the existing road network (authorized and un-authorized roads; and maintain an inventory of late successional and old growth forest;</p> <p>E) Include specific provisions for recreation goals in the M&E Plan, such as regular meetings to discuss trail conditions, management/plan for volunteer workdays or more extensive professional trail work; and develop collaborative partnerships; and</p>	171, 547, 569, 599, 609, 829, 833

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	F) Include the following in the M&E Plan: Strong monitoring and adaptive management programs, including support for watershed analysis, and monitoring and evaluation of BMP effectiveness and watershed restoration success; and an opportunity to assess the impacts of land management actions and to propose adaptive approaches to forest land management; describe how Forest-level monitoring tiers to regional monitoring efforts; and see list of other M&E Plan suggestions in comment letter #833.	
098	The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to plant species, habitat, and invasive plants (noxious weeds): A) Evaluate the impacts the Forest Plan may have on the plant species and their habitats; B) Develop a management plan and/or objectives in the Forest Plan to address and reduce invasive species (noxious weeds) from horse use along trails, timber harvest disturbance, grazing, and other uses in the forest; identify the source of these invasive species in the plan; and include education; C) Consider the impacts of herbicides and pesticides used to control noxious weeds, and the effects of these on fish, wildlife, watersheds, and other resources; D) Cooperate with other agencies such as WADOT, county agencies, private landowners etc. and address the management of invasive plants; and E) Change management direction in the DEIS to focus on prevention, effective treatment, monitoring site restoration, early detection, and rapid response rather than on treating a certain number of acres.	58, 62, 114, 138, 145, 267, 288, 299, 309, 326, 437, 482, 528, 583, 599, 618, 620, 625, 699, 800, 833, 838
099	The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to grazing: A) Introduce more productive grasses to offset the losses due to reduced timber harvest and the resulting loss of feed and do not allow native plant reintroduction if it reduces the AUMs in the grazing allotments; and B) Retire grazing allotments because of their affect on the introduction and spread of invasive plants (such as highly flammable cheatgrass), as well as increased soil erosion and reduced water quality, especially in watersheds with other critical resources of concern; and the affect on native plant communities.	62, 652
100	The Forest Service should consider protecting native plant communities and protecting their habitat.	141
101	The Forest Service should identify threatened plants on a map and only address those specific areas for management.	606, 838
102	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the Tools to Expect for Plant Species and Habitats: A) Disclose in the DEIS the name and annual amounts of all herbicides and pesticides used on the OWNF since the adoption of the last Forest Plan and disclose the name and amount of herbicide or pesticide treatment within riparian zones, since the adoption of the last Forest Plan (see page 35-36 of the PA); and B) Clarify what is meant in the PA (page 28) by addressing two groups of plant species, those that “occur” or “may occur” because “may occur” sounds like a new survey and manage constraint which will be time consuming and not allow the agency to move forward with the important work of restoration/forest health activities and commodity production.	326, 547
116	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the NEPA process and/or its decisionmaking process:	167, 171, 268, 288, 362,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>A) No more management actions are required to cut costs and/or a No Action Alternative;</p> <p>B) Actions should be cooperative efforts;</p> <p>C) Recreational experience is needed to resolve complex issues;</p> <p>D) Focus on sustainable yield, and air and water quality;</p> <p>E) Make decisions at the local level;</p> <p>F) Include the 11 management areas contained in the current CNF plan that are based on actual ground conditions;</p> <p>G) The plan is too vague and open to interpretation;</p> <p>H) Develop a NEPA analysis for the Proposed Action;</p> <p>I) Focus on ecosystem restoration and forest health versus commodity production;</p> <p>J) Multiple use of the forest is needed for financial benefits;</p> <p>K) It is unclear how the public will benefit;</p> <p>L) Develop non-discretionary standards;</p> <p>M) Develop direction to determine suitability for competing uses;</p> <p>N) Include the Forest Restoration Strategy for direction;</p> <p>O) Restore a rational number of management allocations;</p> <p>P) Develop an Active Restoration 1 management area that would allow active restoration combined with less intensive management with road densities limited to one mile per square mile;</p> <p>Q) Adjust management area boundaries to watershed boundaries for ease of management;</p> <p>R) Disclose site-specific scheduled timber harvest;</p> <p>S) Retain valid decisions from the current Forest Plan (see comment letter #625 for specifics);</p> <p>T) Compare and contrast vehicle use to baseline data to establish a threshold on which the significance of the impacts of the preliminary proposals can be determined for each alternative, and additionally how the alternatives differ from the current conditions;</p> <p>U) Disclose the impacts of the management directions not only to natural resources but also to human necessities like recreation;</p> <p>V) Restrictive land use designations will not allow the plan stated goals of providing recreation access, facilities, and services; and providing roads, services, and accommodations to support local economies;</p> <p>W) The Travel Management Plan and/or Motorized Vehicle Use Maps are needed for commenting in conjunction with the Proposed Action to see the overall effect on recreational opportunities;</p> <p>X) Achieving ecological, social, and economic sustainability will not be limited unless there are overriding regulations;</p> <p>Y) Revision to the existing Forest Plans will not apply retrospectively to projects that have been implemented in the past, as they will only apply to new projects and new developments; or if this is not the case, provide the elements of the revision that would be applied in a retroactive fashion;</p>	<p>437, 460, 482, 484, 557, 566, 569, 572, 584, 585, 606, 618, 620, 625, 636, 655, 806, 829, 833, 834, 835, 837, 843, 850, 857</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>Z) Identify all relevant analysis, strategies, and plans and they should be consistent; AA) Use issued guidance on the assessment of cumulative impacts by the EPA found at: http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/nepa.html, including assumptions that will be used for adjacent landowners; BB) Restoration actions can produce a hands-off management approach that can lead to future catastrophic wildfire and/or widespread disease; CC) Increased development on private land adjacent to NFS lands does not hamper planning and/or administration; DD) Focus efforts to simplify and streamline management with more common descriptions of national forest and state forests, consistent laws and rules for their use, and less permits; and EE) Evaluate all alternatives through a case study approach using recent decisions to determine if they will make it easier or harder to accomplish project decisions and describe if they will achieve the scale of decision for landscape restoration needs.</p>	
122	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding developed campgrounds and/or day use areas: A) Develop more campgrounds; B) Add specifics for campground closures and/or limiting day use due to lack of funding; C) Add lookouts to rental program, unless staffed by professionals; D) Develop a unified system with the National Park that would enable accurate accounting of visitor use of specific campgrounds and dock facilities on Lake Chelan; E) Maintain and/or add more refuge cabins in areas where appropriate; F) Install a toilet and/or vaulted outhouse at Frenchman Coulee; and G) Do not limit day use opportunities to residents immediately adjacent to the national forest.</p>	70, 178, 184, 528, 620, 655, 835, 842, 852,
123	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding motorized summer ATV and/or single track recreation: A) Create more areas and/or trail systems that are connected to these activities; B) No closures and/or conversions of trails to non-motorized status; C) Illegal ATV/ORV use; D) These activities generate revenue for local economies; E) Prohibit use of noisy vehicles; F) Designate use areas away from private residents and/or non-motorized use areas; G) These activities are not in the top six recreation-based priorities sampled in 2004; H) Utilize snowmobile trails for these activities; I) Improvements have been made to ATVs and/or off-road motorcycles to make them more environmental friendly; J) Volunteer groups provide maintenance and/or trail improvements; K) Consider the use of motorized vehicles equitably because demand is increasing; L) Motorized vehicles transport the disabled and senior citizens; M) Monitor use and provide for immediate closure of areas that show impacts to resources and/or wildlife;</p>	34, 94, 99, 126, 169, 273, 290, 362, 483, 502, 519, 540, 584, 585, 604, 613, 620, 630, 636, 653, 655, 669, 697, 699, 727, 883

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>N) Analyze ATV/ORV use to determine where motorized use can and cannot be allowed; O) Develop a monitoring program that will enforce ATV/OHV laws before the needed expansion of the trail system; P) Prohibit use in areas that would damage or harm fish, wildlife, and other resources; Q) Increased ATV/ORV use displaces hikers whom outnumber motorized users; R) Analyze impacts to increased fire risk, fiscal capacity to monitor, enforce, restore damaged areas, and maintain the trail system; S) Consider motorized recreation on adjoining or nearby state lands; T) Limit and/or prohibit motorized access close to and/or adjacent to the Pacific Crest Trail to prevent illegal use of it; U) Decisions contemplated in all of the action alternatives are based on a flawed analysis of the recreation existing condition, a flawed needs analysis, and flawed assumptions that closing roads and trails to motorized uses dramatically improves the effectiveness of wildlife habitat of which the rationale expressed for restricting motorized vehicle use is tied to incomplete research and grossly excessive extrapolation of research data that contradicts the current condition on the ground today; V) Adding additional wilderness and non-motorized designations will limit expansion of the trail system; and W) Designate and sign use as open unless posted closed.</p>	
124	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding motorized winter recreation and/or snowmobiling: A) Analyze impacts from snowmobile use, associated facilities and activities on resources, soundscapes, wilderness, and non-motorized use to determine appropriate areas of use and management actions; B) Provide highly visible signage, education materials, and maps to area snowmobile clubs and dealers to help minimize illegal use and the need for enforcement with diminishing budgets; C) Disclose data on actual intrusions into the wilderness; D) Disclose explanations for discrepancies in snowmobile use number versus cross-country skiing derived from the NVUM report and those in the Proposed Action (see comment letter #33 for specific FS document citations); E) Snowmobile use best meets the needs of the recreating public, which is the first stated purpose of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act; F) Snowmobile use generates substantial revenue to local economies; G) Input from snowmobilers has been ignored; H) Snowmobile clubs and/or individuals maintain numerous trails; I) Unlawful, snowmobile wilderness trespass contiguous to the proposal area will nullify any designated winter non-motorized area that borders wilderness; J) Impose emission standards for snowmobiles; K) Disclose specifics on how management activities will reduce disturbance, displacement, and restrict winter use to designated routes; L) Enforcement will be a continual problem.</p>	<p>3, 4, 14, 33, 45, 97, 107, 155, 199, 278, 414, 461, 488, 495, 502, 506, 513, 533, 540, 560, 584, 595, 598, 599, 608, 620, 625, 630, 701, 723, 755, 815, 836, 840, 845, 849, 853, 857, 865, 866, 879, 882</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
125	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding non-motorized summer recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Address horseback use in Entiat and prioritize completion of the North Fork trailhead horse camp development; B) Enhance and/or increase whitewater boating access; C) Enhance and/or increase mountain bike access and/or use by encouraging ski area special use holders to consider mountain bike parks; D) Enhance and/or increase saddle and/or pack stock access (see comment letter #520 for a Position Statement on the Wilderness Purity Concept); E) Create accessible areas close to communities; F) Combining mountain bike use with motorized use makes it dangerous and many of the trails are too difficult; G) Convert roads that are to be decommissioned that do not have steep grades to mountain bike use with parking pull-outs for 1-3 cars at the point where the roads intersect with maintained access roads; H) Monitor areas and/or trails used by horses and/or pack stock; and I) In the background section for Recreation, Methow Valley fishing and hunting on NFS lands should be included and grazing should be eliminated 	62, 73, 292, 466, 471, 520, 546, 563, 586, 587, 691
126	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding non-motorized winter recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Analyze management and the impacts caused from snowmobile use on non-motorized winter recreation; B) Provide a list of Nordic areas; C) Analyze cross-country skiing as an alternative to motorized recreation; D) Include areas in the unroaded Wenatchee Mountains crest area (see comment letter #513 for photos, link to website for Proposal 1 map and other specifics); E) Include areas in the unroaded Wenatchee Mountains crest area (see comment letter #513 for link to website for Proposal 2 map and other specifics); F) Include areas in the unroaded Wenatchee Mountains crest area (see comment letter #513 for link to website for Proposal 3 map and other specifics); G) Enhance and/or increase cross-country ski and/or snowshoeing trails and/or snowparks; and H) Use planning efforts for ski areas as an example. 	288, 513, 592, 598, 619, 620, 724, 806, 837, 844
127	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding other special use permits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Add the use of recreation residences; B) Require annual safety reports from commercial outfitters; C) Investigate viable options to add independent guides versus the current guest guide system (see comment letter #29); D) Revoke and/or reduce the allocation of use and/or assign all or part of the holder's use to others for all commercial guides that have substantially more user days that they actually use each year; E) Disclose and review all known utility right-of-ways, including electrical transmission lines, petroleum/natural gas pipelines, 	176, 275, 291, 303, 326, 377, 466, 528, 562, 571, 578, 622, 692, 806, 837

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>and phone lines;</p> <p>F) Provide ski area operators assurance that their long-term investments, planning, and stewardship commitments required to provide quality, healthy alpine skiing venues and economically sustainable business models will be considered;</p> <p>G) Remove the developed sites from the designated late-successional reserves network, per Regional Forester Directive 05/23/05;</p> <p>H) Exempt all winter sports special use permits including the outfitter guides and the North Cascade Heli operation from the whole landscape approach;</p> <p>I) Clarify statement on page 19 that reads “Prior planning did little to consider the needs of winter recreationists.” As it this statement does not take into account the significant amount of planning, environmental analysis, and, more importantly, investment in recreation infrastructure by the network of ski area operators;</p> <p>J) Adjust permits issued for heli skiing or snowmobiling to exclude areas not contiguous to Wilderness and National Park lands;</p> <p>K) Acknowledge that any policies adopted will not preclude the implementation of the settlement agreement between Seattle City Light and the CNF and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission license measures;</p> <p>L) The permitted heli skiing are is near the Pacific Crest Trail, which is non-motorized;</p> <p>M) Allow ski area permit holders to consider mountain bike parks; and</p> <p>N) Address on-going maintenance needs for various communication sites, utilities, access roads, and other related facilities.</p>	
128	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding outfitter and guide permits:</p> <p>A) Provide a list of all horse and/or pack camps;</p> <p>B) Address outfitter and guide use as it pertains to effective recreation management; and</p> <p>C) Reassess commercial use authorization practices to streamline and standardize policies for commercial and non-profit users that traverse a small section of NFs land in route to or from the National Park.</p>	460, 492, 528, 581
129	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding recreation settings and experiences:</p> <p>A) Address use compatibility, conflict, and safety;</p> <p>B) Disclose if the current Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) is still valid;</p> <p>C) Clarify why uses are only valid where there are few conflicts with other users; and</p> <p>D) Ensure drivers are operating vehicles on roads and trails in a safe manner.</p>	252, 275, 288, 383, 492, 581, 655, 707, 889
130	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding tools to expect and/or proposed management actions for recreation:</p> <p>A) Follow core principles of connecting to nature through public lands in a variety of ways for people with different interests and skill levels; conserve and respect our natural, historic, and cultural heritage by preserving the integrity, health and resilience of these unique ecosystems, and cultural and historic assets; encourage use of and access to public lands that inspires respect for and pride in their beauty, health, diversity, and special value to the nation and to the world; and promote</p>	62, 177, 288, 438, 492, 513, 529, 563, 580, 581, 583, 597, 599, 625, 699, 806, 834, 838, 840, 889

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>enjoyable, safe, and sustainable, recreation through sound land use planning (see comment letter #177);</p> <p>B) Identify recreational preferences of user groups and link recreational settings to preferences;</p> <p>C) Explain how decisions result in quality opportunities for user groups;</p> <p>D) Use the ROS to proactively plan for recreation opportunities that will maximize social and ecological sustainability as required by the ROS handbook;</p> <p>E) Admit management of NFS Lands is all about recreation;</p> <p>F) Address other partnerships and/or ownership;</p> <p>G) Prioritize the restoration of areas where recreation activities have degraded habitat and take active measures to minimize the effects to these habitats;</p> <p>H) Address outfitter and guide use, such as the value of more qualified, professional technical guides as additional resources in the field;</p> <p>I) Manage winter recreation according to Executive Order 11644;</p> <p>J) Allow volunteer groups to assist as needed;</p> <p>K) Provide education for proper recreational use and encourage continued assistance;</p> <p>L) Allow horsemen to use chainsaws to clear trails in unusual circumstances;</p> <p>M) Allow appropriate construction, improvements, and maintenance of roads, bridges, trails, camping/picnic areas, parking, trailheads, water access points, etc. that will enhance the outdoor experience and meet the public demands;</p> <p>N) Give due care and consideration when proposing limitations or decommissioning sites of historical use;</p> <p>O) The role of recreational opportunities in local economies and emphasize revenue production that assists the County with providing support services for these activities;</p> <p>P) Coordinate with other federal, state, county, and local agencies;</p> <p>Q) Disclose how recreational access differs from the diverse array of system trails;</p> <p>R) Disclose the reliability of NVUM data and how it will be used;</p> <p>S) Focus managing expectations to share the forest rather than denying use of it;</p> <p>T) Provide for increased recreational access and/or needs as the population increases;</p> <p>U) It is contrary to the stated objectives of the Great Outdoor Initiative in that it increases wilderness designation and/or implies that current level of access is harmful to the environment, and as such, management decisions should not be proposed or implemented to resolve local issues;</p> <p>V) Recreation generates much needed revenue for local economies; and</p> <p>W) Retire grazing allotments to benefit local economies and use those funds to support Forest recreational opportunities.</p>	
131	<p>The Forest Service should consider that dispersed camping discourages use of fee-based, authorized, established campsites, which results in revenue reduction and they present potential fire hazards, litter, and garbage and as such they should be discouraged and/or not allowed.</p>	176, 377

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
132	The Forest Service should and/or should not consider user fees and/or give preference over commercial use of an area to those who are required to pay fees.	270, 275, 567, 570
133	The Forest Service should consider reliability of NVUM data and how it will be used in the analysis.	311, 381, 383, 466, 4852, 513, 520, 521, 585, 587, 605, 609, 625, 707, 823, 837
134	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding firewood: A) Charge less for permits if the cutter's wood burning devise is environmentally friendly.	114
135	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding salvage: A) Manage salvage logging created by fire, insects, and disease as part of forest restoration because it will generate both jobs and revenue versus wasting natural resources; B) Analyze the benefits and/or effects of biomass utilization; C) Consider the article, Promoting Ecological Sustainability, by Janowiak and Webster, January 2010 (see comment letter #177); and D) Consider biomass is not a sustainable energy source.	73, 88, 177, 270, 311, 326, 599, 625, 840, 850
136	The Forest Service should continue to allow permits and access for gathering and/or cutting special forest products.	309, 361, 699, 798, 800
137	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the allowable sale quantity (ASQ) for timber: A) Develop a science-based annual maximum limit to ensure forest health and sustainability goals; B) Use of pole and firewood estimated volumes have been used as an addition to the volume of timber sold; C) Harvest within WUIs is the only management of commercial timber that is occurring; D) Less than a third of the ASQ has ever been sold; E) Disclose the ASQ that will be removed annually under the ecosystem restoration and forest health approach, what analysis was done to determine this, what information was used, what entities were consulted, and compare and contrast management descriptions to help the public visualize potential management direction; F) Construct modeling and analysis of management scenarios that are unconstrained by budget to establish a baseline from which a reasonable range of alternatives may be considered.	127, 270, 326, 407, 437, 565, 850,
138	The Forest Service should consider the following regarding timber harvest: A) Return to original intent of the agency that encourages the responsible growth and harvest of timber; B) Disclose all special products currently harvested; C) Add a quantitative discussion about the amount of material utilized and the economic value of the material; D) Harvesting cedar damages riparian zones; E) No burning while logging, and utilize small logs and other materials that are piled after a timber sale by hauling them to a	5, 10, 58, 61, 70, 114, 117, 123, 125, 130, 284, 326, 392, 444, 450, 508, 540, 543, 545, 547, 580, 583, 594, 595, 620, 655, 834, 838

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>biomass plant or by sending them to the mill;</p> <p>F) Increase stewardship contracts to save money and increase the amount of acreage being treated;</p> <p>G) Use European management; which thins trees, after a cut all types of trees are planted, and unsuitable wood is left to mulch and provide nitrogen;</p> <p>H) Disclose why timber harvest is constrained by funding;</p> <p>I) Change the process for bidding by dividing it into acres per year and the bid areas for 10 or 20 years;</p> <p>J) Discontinue sales until the market puts forest products in greater demand;</p> <p>K) Tree growth for production is part of the national forest;</p> <p>L) Log in some noncontiguous areas leaving a continuous corridor north of those areas;</p> <p>M) Restrict logging and associated road building;</p> <p>N) Analyze all proposed timber harvest operations and associated road construction;</p> <p>O) Discuss exports from other countries and/or private land to meet demand for timber;</p> <p>P) Removal of excess, diseased, and damaged trees for stand improvement is like thinning carrots (see comment letter #392);</p> <p>Q) Prohibit abusive logging;</p> <p>R) Identify potential vegetation management and harvest volumes;</p> <p>S) Harvest is at a third of past levels, thus rendering a sick and dying or burnt-out forest;</p> <p>T) Reduced harvest is offset by imported timber from other countries that do not have regulations;</p> <p>U) Strive to maintain or increase the values and integrity of such assets;</p> <p>V) Implement tree farming annually in appropriate areas that have been previously roaded and logged;</p> <p>W) Use current data to depict supply and demand, such as DNR reports and/or Warren studies issued after 2004;</p> <p>X) Adopt an aggressive approach that increases harvest and thinning activities; drives increased economic activity; provides better habitat, bio fuel, fiber, and wood; reduces fire hazard; and generates revenue that could be applied to land maintenance and/or management (see comment letter #545);</p> <p>Y) No direction from the Forest Service Chief was issued to deemphasize commodity reduction;</p> <p>Z) Regional Forester has emphasized dependency on timber industry to accomplish objectives of fulfilling contracts and providing associated work to maintain jobs through these difficult times (see comment letter# 547);</p> <p>AA) Recognize it as a legitimate use;</p> <p>BB) Making it a residual use is in violation of the Organic Act and Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act;</p> <p>CC) Improved harvest methods result in improved forest health;</p> <p>DD) The loss of timber revenues combined with insufficient management of forested lands has resulted in an unsustainable cycle of poor forest health; therefore actively work to consolidate land holdings and dispose of properties that no longer meet the Forest Service mission as a way to better manage public lands; and</p> <p>EE) Develop an estimate for the contribution of local supply using a consistent basis of comparison.</p>	

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
139	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding tools to expect and/or management actions for renewable forest products:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Cover all costs associated with any project and/or permit by the renewable forest product; B) Require that harvested or disturbed forests be replanted to meet stocking levels and reduce fuels to achieve condition class; C) Harvesting and replanting are an essential part of a renewable crop and proper management; D) Prohibit new road building for timber harvest; E) Quantify and analyze the total areas that have restrictions for commodity production relative to the potential effect of insect and disease moving between management areas and the ability to suppress wildfires as they might affect private land, communities, and those areas that are designated for commercial timber production; F) Commit to active timber management as a tool for sustainable forest health; and G) Focus on restoration and forest health versus commodity production 	275, 309, 508, 540, 547, 583, 594, 599, 699, 723, 800
140	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding scenery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Ensure active scenery management because driving through the forest is the highest use of NFS lands; B) Ensure active management to retain adjacent property values and/or uses; C) Cut trees along Highway 20 and/or other highways and roads to open vistas; D) Ensure active management along trails; E) Provide photos showing both sides of I-90 and Highway 2 within the OWNF and identify national forest, state, and private ownership along with the type of land management; F) Provide an analysis of the changes depicted in the photos provided in comment letter #392; G) Include more detail on how the desired future condition of maintained and enhanced scenery will be achieved; H) Disclose whether the Scenic Management System (SMS) will continue to guide and/or restrict project specific impacts and if not, provide details of the system that will replace SMS; I) Management actions cannot be taken in wilderness; J) Active scenery management is needed to prevent insect infestations and/or diseased trees, which lead to catastrophic fires and in turn diminishes the quality of the scenery; and K) Utilize creative and/or selective logging management to minimize effects. 	70, 180, 231, 278, 288, 326, 392, 547, 595, 625, 655, 781, 838
141	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding air quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Management air quality is important as forest management activities can create deterioration; B) Integrate science-based management practices into all proposed alternatives; and C) Address management of air quality and include flexibility to adapt to changes in regulatory requirements. 	10, 114, 326, 850
142	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding economics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Analyze the effect on local economies that are dependent upon recreation and/or commodities derived from the forest; 	62, 70, 177, 231, 244, 309, 361, 365, 381, 482,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>B) Provide a detailed and thorough analysis looking at all sectors of the regional economy and how national and international markets and/or political factors influence economic activity related to the national forest;</p> <p>C) Use models that are easily understandable with relevant parameter values that are adequately justified;</p> <p>D) Use the references cited to demonstrate the economic contribution of ecosystem services (see comment letter #177);</p> <p>E) Summarize benefits to local communities that have designated wilderness nearby (see table of Benefits of Wilderness in comment letter #498);</p> <p>F) Analyze benefits to local communities only as a regional level obscures impacts;</p> <p>G) Analyze cumulative impacts and benefits from all associated activities, such as loss of timber harvests, forest products such as firewood, grazing rights, recreation and travel access, and broader wilderness designations;</p> <p>H) Give the highest priority to the effects on the economy, other considerations are secondary;</p> <p>I) Analyze the total employment growth during the period 1984-2009 and compare this growth to the 1984 estimate of forest-generated jobs;</p> <p>J) Compare the estimate for current (2009-2011) OWNF generated jobs and estimated jobs generated by each Forest Plan alternative to total actual current full-time and part time employment in the Wenatchee National Forest economic influence zone (EIZ), which includes all employment, not just wage and salary jobs (as was done in the 1990 Forest Plan) to account for the substantial employment in the agricultural sector and such comparisons should break out each major industrial sector;</p> <p>K) Analyze the relative importance of timber to the local economy since 1984;</p> <p>L) Analyze the forest's contribution to the full tourism economy of the EIZ and compare the contribution of the EIZ's tourism to the major industrial sectors of the five-county EIZ economy;</p> <p>M) The statement that suggests this sub-region's (EIZ) dependence upon natural resources has always been strong is at least misleading and otherwise factually incorrect;</p> <p>N) Track timber outputs of the OWNF separately so that they can be compared to historical outputs of the two Forests;</p> <p>O) Analyze the effects of maintaining a large forest road network including what recreational activities are supported by what type of road system;</p> <p>P) Cattle grazing is a negative economic impact; and</p> <p>Q) Utilize the of recreational trail use (see comment letter #724).</p>	<p>483, 498, 502, 519, 535, 580, 620, 655, 684, 699, 711, 724, 800, 835, 837, 838, 840</p>
143	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding social effects:</p> <p>A) Include impact statements in the DEIS; and</p> <p>B) Include health and safety.</p>	711, 838
144	The Forest Service should consider maintaining and restoring soil productivity.	569
146	The Forest Service analysis of biological legacies should disclose how the desired conditions will be achieved for amounts of snags and coarse woody debris; how adaptive management will successfully improve meeting targets; and the impacts of post treatment activities such as firewood cutting in light of the regional assessment indicating the availability of greater than	625

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	20 inch snag habitat is generally lacking from past management practices and has altered disturbance regimes.	
147	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding composition:</p> <p>A) Management has eliminated forage areas;</p> <p>B) Disclose how timber harvest will be used to achieve the desired structural stage distribution;</p> <p>C) Identify the historic range of shrub steppe habitat in eastern Washington including the location, acreage, how much is utilized by sage grouse, and how much is under grazing leases;</p> <p>D) 3.6 percent is unaccounted for in the categories found in Table 2; therefore provide more information such as how the natural condition is determined including integration with aquatic, riparian, and habitat goals; what is the current state in terms of the defined measures and how does it differ from a proposed desired condition; what will determine the minimum area of old forest; what will prevent management to minimum desired condition for number of old trees if this is the structural stage distribution of the original primary forest when it was affected by the historic fire regime before logging and fire suppression; if not, what is the current structural stage distribution at a watershed level; what factors make this particular structural stage distribution desired; why is a greater percentage in the old forest stages not desired; how much of the younger stages currently exist and where are they predominate; and a large amount of acreage in the Entiat area is fire regenerated and appears fairly homogenous so is this reflected in the stem exclusion open or closed canopy category in the table and is this desired or just recorded as present condition;</p> <p>E) Disclose the research and area used to develop patches size and percentage, if it is based on historic conditions with natural fire regime, and what patch size old growth animal and plant species are dependent upon;</p> <p>F) Disclose if there are more than 1.4 to 2.1 snags per acre that are greater than 20 inches DBH occurring naturally that will be left and if not, what situations would dictate reducing the naturally occurring number;</p> <p>G) Address Mesic forest desired future condition because they are the most productive and comprise a significant portion of the CNF;</p> <p>H) Reconsider the 25 inch diameter limit imposed on Ponderosa Pine as it restricts silvicultural options, it will lead to increased forest health problems, and it is inconsistent with the desire that large trees should not limit nearby older trees through resource competition;</p> <p>I) Identify applicable scientific research and other information that are based on the historic range of variability and/or biologically determined habitat requirements that would maintain viable or self sustaining populations of native species and more precisely defines and justifies vegetative desired conditions so numerical standards can be adopted for renewable forest products;</p> <p>J) Use Yanishevsky 1994 to determine requirements for the numbers of large old tees, snags, and down logs;</p> <p>K) Use the Northwest Forest Plan to determine elimination of late-successional reserves (see comment letter #595);</p> <p>L) Disclose rationale for choosing between desired structural stage distribution and historic conditions, and the impacts of the choice when there is a substantive difference between the two;</p>	<p>118, 326, 484, 547, 569, 595, 625, 655, 683, 692, 833, 850, 858, 887</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>M) Suppression of disturbances or salvage commodities following a natural disturbance are counter to restoration of ecosystem function;</p> <p>N) Retention of large, younger trees in the best condition not limiting nearby older trees through resource completion cannot be met in wilderness and is limited in backcountry non-motorized;</p> <p>O) Use cited references (see comment letter #683);</p> <p>P) Add low elevation dry forest of Ponderosa Pine like those found in the lower Mad River;</p> <p>Q) Address and prioritize MA direction, prescriptions, land allocations, desired conditions, associated goals, objectives, standards and guidelines to provide approaches that will maintain and restore an appropriate mixture of forest habitat types and seral stages to provide for the conservation and reproduction of the full complement of flora and fauna native to the Northeast Washington Zone;</p> <p>R) Quantify current forest conditions and the desired conditions and disclose information such as what data source, at what scale and at what interval are the conditions proposed to be measured; why all the example ranges start at zero; if the objectives would be applicable to riparian areas as well as uplands; consideration of down-slope dry forest areas would be incapable of supporting 18 trees of >25 inches dbh per acre but are important for species of management concern; how does the dry forest objective for large trees incorporate such areas; how are the structural stages specifically parameterized; and what are the definitions of young and old;</p> <p>S) Canopy diversification can result from an extended period of stand initiation;</p> <p>T) Clarify if the calculation of snags per acre takes into account the presence of patches of closed forest within larger areas of dry forest or the dry forest is defined as a forest without other patches embedded; and</p> <p>U) Increase rainforest for future generations.</p>	
148	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding fire management:</p> <p>A) Define and disclose all management tools, such as planned ignitions and the effects of these actions on all resources along with the acres planned to be treated;</p> <p>B) Develop a Fire Management Action Plan to help with alternative development, as outlined in the Guidance for Implementation of Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy issued February 13, 2009;</p> <p>C) Uncharacteristic wildfires have been happening since 1967;</p> <p>D) Utilized the Wenatchee Forestry Sciences Lab document Vegetative Systems Proposed Actions document to help determine fuels management and condition class;</p> <p>E) Include information on uncharacteristic fires and acknowledge the need for aggressive fuels management to meet desired condition classes;</p> <p>F) Include how fire will be used as an ecosystem process and the desired fire regime condition class;</p> <p>G) Describe desired conditions at a scale that provides a meaningful foundation for objectives with measurable timelines for planned fuel treatments, the use of unplanned fire, suppression of unplanned fire, and post fire restoration and/or</p>	<p>10, 62, 167, 299, 309, 377, 437, 482, 528, 569, 617, 618, 620, 625, 652, 655, 699, 723, 790, 800, 812, 838, 850, 858</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>rehabilitation;</p> <p>H) Uncharacteristic wildfires are a result of lack of active management found in the standards and guidelines in the Eastside Screens and Northwest Forest Plan;</p> <p>I) Coordinate wildland fire planning, fuel reduction, fire management, and suppression with the National Park Service;</p> <p>J) The term uncharacteristic feeds the tendency towards indiscriminate fire suppression;</p> <p>K) Incorporate best available science for management of post fire forests found in The Committee of Scientists 1999;</p> <p>L) Unplanned ignitions should comply with the Stevens County Fire Plan and other emergency response systems;</p> <p>M) Emphasize controlled burning, let it burn policies, duff reduction, and pruning with the goal of restoration, not targets;</p> <p>N) Prohibit the use of planned or unplanned fire as it burns valuable resources that can be harvested in a more fiscally responsible manner contributing to local economies;</p> <p>O) Maintain the use of fire outside of wilderness areas where they can be easily kept under control with motorized vehicle access;</p> <p>P) Increased wilderness will exacerbate the amount of wildfire because it is not managed for prevention;</p> <p>Q) Management designations that limit access are contrary to the priority of protecting human life;</p> <p>R) Fire management is limited in wilderness and backcountry non-motorized designations;</p> <p>S) Fire management is a dominant ecological process, its use is essential for restoration, and it is cost effective;</p> <p>T) Incorporate the information for the USFWS Fire Effects Guide (see comment letter #790);</p> <p>U) Address smoke inhalation, human threat of life, dead animals, and lost habitat;</p> <p>V) Address air quality and the need to change as required per regulations in the State Implementation Plan;</p> <p>W) Coordinate with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to minimize seasonal impacts to wildlife concentrations and to ensure mutual management objectives; and</p> <p>X) Fire-fighting resources would be more available if “controlled burns” were eliminated, and fire was restored to its natural role and managed rather than suppressed/fought.</p>	
149	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding insects and disease:</p> <p>A) Increase herbicide and pesticide treatments;</p> <p>B) Disclose any effects to the spotted owl;</p> <p>C) Identify areas with large red ant mounds;</p> <p>D) Develop a plan for management of insects and disease;</p> <p>E) Permit harvesting and road access for management of insects and disease ;</p> <p>F) Implement an early detection rapid response integrated plan that would focus on treating small infestations before they become large unsolvable problems because proactive management is more effective than delayed implementation; and</p> <p>G) Wilderness areas are a breeding ground because of the management designations.</p>	178, 288, 326, 377, 585, 625, 655, 850
150	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding making ecosystems more resilient to disturbance driven by climate</p>	35, 299, 309, 625, 655,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>change, fire, insects and disease; and also produce quality timber commodities:</p> <p>A) Ensure higher intensity management occurs closer to homes and communities;</p> <p>B) Ensure lower intensity management occurs closer to recommended wilderness and backcountry;</p> <p>C) Focusing on restoration is more important than commodity production;</p> <p>D) Plan work in a timely fashion for controversial areas or management areas with difficult standards and guidelines;</p> <p>E) Increase restoration in WRIA 46 and the WUI and emphasize coordination with other agencies;</p> <p>F) Disclose how the CNF proposes to maintain and promote these dynamics and components across the landscape, the extent to which the CNF will permit natural disturbance to do this work, and how approaching vegetative management in an integrated manner would differ from the current approach of assigning an ID team to proposed projects;</p> <p>G) Allow ecosystem function and natural disturbance to assume the role of maintaining resiliency once the system has recovered from degradation, damage, and destruction;</p> <p>H) Indicate the appropriate return cycle for future maintenance once the commodity-producing first round of maintenance has been implemented;</p> <p>I) Develop science-based criteria to balance the abundant social criteria when determining when timber salvage and post fire logging is appropriate;</p> <p>J) Wilderness and/or backcountry management designations limit these actions;</p> <p>K) Analyze landscape pattern, function, and young tree stand treatments for reduction;</p> <p>L) Discourage land use designations that would hinder restoration efforts; and</p> <p>M) Incorporate management approaches that produce self-sustaining, resilient ecological systems that can supply a variety of ecosystem services.</p>	<p>699, 723, 724, 800, 833, 838</p>
151	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding management of vegetation within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI):</p> <p>A) Grazing lowers fire risk;</p> <p>B) Make vegetation management within the WUI the highest priority;</p> <p>C) Incorporate low elevation trail thinning with vegetation management within the WUI;</p> <p>D) Reduce the risk of fire through active management and restoration;</p> <p>E) Include 250,000 acres in the Entiat Valley Community Wildfire Protection Plan in the WUI;</p> <p>F) Consider Regional Forester’s direction in August 18, 2005 memo;</p> <p>G) Only four percent of the Forest is being treated;</p> <p>H) Discourage sport falling of large trees during wildfires;</p> <p>I) The Forest Service is not obligated to protect homes within and/or near high fire danger areas and/or adjacent to its boundary;</p> <p>J) Limit the areas within the WRIA 46 and Entiat Valley Community Wildfire Protection Plan Wildland Urban Interface limited</p>	<p>70, 167, 278, 309, 326, 699, 725, 800, 812</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>to congressionally designated wilderness, Entiat Experimental Forest, riparian reserves, Active Restoration 3; Silver Falls National Recreation Trail, Thompson Clover Research Natural Area, Lake Creek Special Interest Area and administrative and recreation sites;</p> <p>K) Vegetation management within the WUI is not a reason to increase harvest; and</p> <p>L) Develop a training packet of objectives related to issues other than fire.</p>	
152	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding old growth:</p> <p>A) Protect and/or enhance it with active management;</p> <p>B) Disclose the appropriateness of the Northwest Forest Plan;</p> <p>C) Eliminate unrealistic old growth;</p> <p>D) Disclose whether a forestwide inventory of old growth has been developed for the CNF;</p> <p>E) Include a desired future condition and a comprehensive discussion and/or analysis of the importance of restoring old growth for all forest types;</p> <p>F) Disclose the management actions and/or prescriptions that will be used for restoration and indicate whether they would be implemented in stands already meeting the definition for old growth;</p> <p>G) Utilize NEWFC guidance for Objectives and Broad Guidance for the NEWFC Active Management Area and NEWFC Restoration Area and note that thinning is limited to dry forest(see comment letter #314);</p> <p>H) Disclose which particular key components of the Strategy 2000 (ICBEMP) were reviewed in the process of developing guidance for old growth;</p> <p>I) Prohibit harvesting of old growth in areas that have been previously logged;</p> <p>J) Lack of wildlife monitoring and a forestwide inventory causes continued public concern;</p> <p>K) Incorporate a discussion regarding the need for management of old growth, and the benefits and values including carbon sequestration;</p> <p>L) Utilize references cited (see comment letter #598);</p> <p>M) Provide an adequate network that meets the intent of not only the Forest but the Region;</p> <p>N) Reference and/or include the latest iteration of the Forest Restoration Strategy and the Large and Old Tree Policy;</p> <p>O) Address the concept of connectivity between this habitat with similar benchmarks for key areas to manage for during the life of this Forest Plan and how this is done in a proposed action without reserves;</p> <p>P) Utilize references cited in comment letter #599;</p> <p>W) Road density targets for all reserves will be exceeded unless the provisions made from the documents and/or maps provided are used (see comment letter# 599 Table LS-2 on page 10 and attachments 2, 3, and 4);</p> <p>Q) Cross- reference inventory of reserve stands during ground disturbing projects;</p> <p>R) Remove areas from Backcountry Motorized that are currently old growth until the Travel Management Plan is completed;</p> <p>S) Fire damage does not justify removal of areas;</p>	<p>97, 177, 278, 285, 314, 533, 540, 560, 569, 598, 599, 618, 620, 684, 685, 690, 701, 754, 755, 787, 837, 840, 863, 872, 885, 886</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>T) Define old growth as late-successional ecosystems that also include younger trees; U) Do not trade water storage capacity for old growth around Bumping Lake; and V) Remove designation of old growth from developed sites, such as work centers, campgrounds, and ski areas as per Regional Forester Directive 05-23-05.</p>	
153	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding tools to expect and/or management actions for vegetative systems: A) Include the use of plant specific insects as herbicides damage and/or destroy more species and poison the soil and pollinators; B) Provide more site-specific information regarding when, where, and how management activities will occur; C) Wording in the Proposed Action about a “different paradigm for land management” and a “shift from commodity production” contradicts the public statements that policies will remain unchanged; D) Specify outcomes for each MA rather than a reliance on road density; E) Incorporate the use of recognized silvicultural methods used in forest management, such as pesticide and herbicide treatments, to address insect and disease damage; reforestation methods, both natural and tree planting; a program of fuel reduction both manual and mechanical in areas where increased risk of human-caused wildfire exists primarily the WUI areas; and higher volume roads; F) Increase production of forest products; G) Incorporate The Forest Restoration Strategy and Large and Old Tree Policy as standards and guidelines for implementation and/or appendices; H) Include a discussion of climate change driven disturbances and the silvicultural prescriptions that will be implemented in making ecosystems more resilient to these disturbances; I) Provide direction on adapting to climate change at the landscape scale; J) Reference and/or address issues found in Adaptations to Climate Change (see comment letter #625); K) Utilize references cited in comment letter #625; L) Treat landscape disturbances as management opportunities and plan for post-disturbance recovery; M) Ensure that tree health is not confused with forest health and vice versa; N) Set restoration goals and priorities through a combination of ecological need, efficacy of treatments, and public support; O) Consider the current and potential growth of the WUI and avenues to mitigate the impact of increasing population; P) Recognize that while managing for ecosystems that occurred 150 to 200 years ago may not be possible, the historical range of variation can still serve as a useful approximation of sustainable conditions, and help shape restoration goals and as information is gained on future ranges of variation; it should be used to guide project objectives; Q) Emphasize the restoration of resilient landscapes as the best way to maintain habitats in the face of climate change; R) Resilience requires restoring and maintaining sustainable structure, function, and composition of ecosystems at multiple</p>	62, 482, 484, 547, 580, 599, 625, 723, 833, 838

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>scales;</p> <p>S) Use a risk management strategy to deal with uncertainty, including uncertainty in future climate;</p> <p>T) Identify a range of possible future scenarios and spread risk by implementing different levels and types of management that address the different scenarios. In addition, assess the landscape drivers of disturbance when developing management options;</p> <p>U) Characterize risk based on a combination of historical regimes, recent trends, current conditions, fire behavior models, and potential future range of variability in climate and risk will differ; therefore consider tradeoffs;</p> <p>V) Protect biological refugia because they are critical to maintaining ecosystem function;</p> <p>W) Develop management for areas previously harvested; and</p> <p>X) Activities that disturb and degrade ecosystems should be avoided or eliminated and allow recovery by natural processes as the most efficient and economical approach.</p>	
154	The Forest Service should define uncharacteristic wildfire and use information and/or science about fire behavior that has been provided by the Forestry Sciences lab and/or the Entiat Community Wildfire Protection Plan.	288, 309
155	The Forest Service should improve habitat for big game and disclose how providing adequate mosaic, rotation of early successional habitat and/or other tools will achieve those conditions.	699, 800, 858
156	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding bighorn sheep:</p> <p>A) Reference the data and/or incorporate it from the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group in the Washington Connected Landscapes Project: Statewide Analysis for habitat connectivity between existing herds;</p> <p>B) Utilize the same objectives and scientific steps as the Payette National Forest (see comment letter #850).</p>	599, 850, 858
157	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the Canada lynx:</p> <p>A) Large designations of land for habitat jeopardize public use and hurt related businesses;</p> <p>B) Ensure illegal snowmobile use will not adversely affect the lynx ;and provide enforcement;</p> <p>C) Coordinate any new plans with the USFWS, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and British Columbia’s Ministry of Environment;</p> <p>D) Reference and/or incorporate specie-specific modeling for alternative development conducted by the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group;</p> <p>E) Include a science-based case for every component of a management strategy included in the revised forest plan that supersedes any component of the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy;</p> <p>F) Include information on habitat relationships at any scale;</p> <p>G) Include research directed at explaining the effects of road density;</p> <p>H) Disclose effects from practices that improve foraging conditions for other predators;</p> <p>I) Disclose effects from invasive plant infestations on habitat;</p>	62, 437, 484, 599, 625, 636, 675, 850, 858

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>J) Utilize references cited in comment letter #599; K) Disclose the effects from habitat fragmentation by facilitating the access of competitors into lynx habitat; L) Maintain or improve the juxtaposition of denning and foraging habitat; M) Revise grazing plans to ensure that the areas where livestock grazing is permissible the allowable number of animal unit months and grazing use levels or standards are compatible with maintaining adequate lynx prey; N) Disclose effects on lynx prey habitat and assess effects that may preclude snow compacting activities in and around Canada lynx; O) There is no justification to support that snowmobile use facilitates predation of lynx primary food source; P) Prohibit any increase in groomed or designated over-the-snow routes; Q) Prohibit any net loss of any of the defined habitat types; R) Clarify what the 70 percent level is related to 70 percent of existing conditions or 70 percent of the LAU area, etc.; S) Clarify whether the tree stem density reduction would preclude pre-commercial thinning where it would be beneficial to hare density; T) Disclose management actions related to forest health, fire risk, and re-vegetation as they relate to lynx habitat that include clear objectives for re-forestation efforts after disturbance; U) Incorporate accelerated restoration of habitat as an objective; V) Include an inventory of existing habitat types at the analysis unit level for monitoring; W) Incorporate the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy; X) Increasing groomed/compacted snow routes would not maintain or improve overall lynx habitat condition; and Y) Ensure no reduction of suitable habitat for this listed species otherwise it doesn't comply with ESA regulations.</p>	
158	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the fisher: A) Provide specific guidance and discussion on the habitat management for the fisher; B) Incorporate conservation assessment and strategies for the fisher; and C) The fisher is a candidate for listing.</p>	857
159	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the gray wolf: A) Include the issue of human acceptance; B) Address how den sites will be protected in coordination with the USFWS and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; C) Ensure protection for the gray wolf in coordination with the USFWS and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife as outlined in the Wolf Conservation Management Plan; D) Provide favorable conditions for the gray wolf; E) Introduction of the gray wolf is contrary to the safety and welfare of humans, and inconsistent with the objectives to provide safe recreational opportunities; F) Populations are hard to track and/or manage and diminish big game populations; therefore actions to reduce populations</p>	62, 599, 625, 723, 835, 850, 857, 858

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>are necessary (see comment letter #835);</p> <p>G) Introduction of the gray wolf provides the high incidence of Hydatid Disease tapeworms, which are ingested and developed in the internal organs and discharged as scat to contaminate and infect other wildlife, grazing cattle, and humans (see comment letter #835);</p> <p>H) Disclose the relationship between the revised Forest Plan and the state’s Wolf Conservation and Management Plan; and</p> <p>I) Retire cattle allotments in gray wolf areas to avoid conflicts between recovering wolf populations and commercial interests.</p>	
160	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding grizzly bear recovery (no specific Forest):</p> <p>A) Display recovery zones for grizzly bears on a map; and</p> <p>B) Provide long-term core desired conditions as shown in Table 7 in the Proposed Action.</p>	502, 858
161	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding grizzly bear recovery for the North Cascades ecosystem:</p> <p>A) No evidence has been found to support the existence of grizzly bear for an extended period of time;</p> <p>B) Coordinate with the National Park Service when the development of potentially high use trails would affect a shared BMU that is currently below the 70 percent core area ratio or which could reduce the core area ratio below 70 percent overall for a shared BMU;</p> <p>C) Consult with local communities for implementation of the recovery plan;</p> <p>D) Include a description for desired conditions in management situations 1 and 2;</p> <p>E) Improve standards from a no net loss policy to one moving toward scientifically set habitat standards of core for each BMU while ensuring connectivity between and within BMUs;</p> <p>F) Provide a time table for implementation towards meeting these goals, while clearly stating that no management action in a BMU in the life of this Plan will result in loss of core habitat under the goals set in the Forest Plan and they should all contribute to meeting the minimum standards set by these goals;</p> <p>G) Goals set for the management of each BMU should be reviewed by the IGBC’s North Cascades Technical Team;</p> <p>H) Utilize recommended use of any peer reviewed finer scale analysis that may become available during the life of this Forest Plan that overlaps this landscape.</p>	445, 528, 583, 599
162	<p>The Forest Service should provide a detailed explanation of both the need to revise management direction and the nature of the desired conditions for grizzly bear recovery in the Colville, Selkirk, and Cabinet/Yaak ecosystem and consider that road density metrics for AR2 and AR3 management areas are merely desired future conditions with no timelines for reaching the desired future condition; therefore it is inaccurate to state that road density will be limited by these MA designations.</p>	625
163	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the amount of wildlife habitat:</p> <p>A) Wildlife habitat should be the first priority;</p> <p>B) Maintain, enhance, and restore wildlife habitat;</p> <p>C) Manage the Manastash area as wildlife habitat;</p>	1, 62, 97, 109, 126, 142, 148, 155, 252, 275, 361, 502, 533, 547, 560, 569, 625, 636, 655, 685, 755,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>D) Allow commercial and public use if there is no impact to wildlife habitat ; E) Utilize references cited in comment letter #361; F) Address viability through assessment of habitat rather than population surveys; G) Having all wildlife well distributed on a forest is an unrealistic requirement that ignores the habitat preferences of wildlife; H) Include standards and management area emphases to ensure viable populations; I) Disclose how the provision for habitat effectiveness will be accomplished; J) Utilize the research done at the Starkey Experimental Forest and Range to determine effectiveness of habitat; K) Utilize the references cited to determine disturbance (see comment letter #655); L) Restrictive land-use designations make monitoring difficult; M) Disclose the current quality and potential capacity of habitat; its use by fish and wildlife on and near the proposed project area; and identify known fish and wildlife corridors, migration routes, and areas of seasonal fish and wildlife congregation; N) Allow actions that would enhance or restore conditions by volunteers and/or groups; and O) Address the special conservation status of designated critical habitat for both terrestrial and aquatic species and disclose how these critical habitats will be managed, especially for listed species; and P) Consider the recent "pilot-grazing" studies sponsored by Washington Cattlemen's Association and WDFW that have shown that cattle grazing is detrimental to deer and elk habitats (See "The Effects of Spring Cattle Grazing on the Nutritional Ecology of Mule Deer (<i>Odocoileus Menionus</i>) in Eastern Washington", 2011. Sara Wagoner, Masters Thesis, Washington State University).</p>	787, 833, 838, 857
164	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding wildlife habitat connectivity: A) Prioritize wildlife habitat connectivity and give it more consideration; B) Disclose the extent of corridors and/or the amount of wildlife habitat connectivity ; C) Disclose what management guidelines there will be to maintain and connect habitat for viable wildlife populations; D) Utilize references cited (see comment letters #599 & 625); E) Prioritize acquisitions for wildlife habitat connectivity ; F) Disclose how species move in their current habitats; G) Provide clear standards, guidelines, and management direction for managers and project staff to consider when an area on the Forest is identified as important for habitat connectivity.</p>	214, 547, 568, 569, 599, 620, 625
165	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding the spotted owl: A) Allow for successful dispersal of juvenile northern spotted owls to new territories; B) Disclose how much suitable habitat is left for new territories to be established; C) Clarify if territory has to be occupied continuously for five years to be considered active or if it means five years of surveys, which find a pair in residence at least once in five years; D) Disclose what happens to a site not found occupied during the survey routine;</p>	484, 583, 599, 620, 850, 857

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>E) Disclose if restrictions will frustrate the role of active management; F) Utilize references cited in comment letter #599; G) Follow the general direction of the USFWS Revised Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl, dated 28 June 2011 and/or the Northwest Forest Plan; H) Utilize the HCP Amendment (see comment letter #850); I) Existing and possible future rule modifications, such that forest practices rules can complement the federal strategy but will require close collaboration with non-federal stakeholders and to be effective might require an interim approach to minimize the potential for conflict, if state and federal implementation occurs at different times; J) It is premature to make policy about the amount and distribution of habitat without proper justification; and K) There is no information in the published or unpublished literature to indicate the occurrence of human disturbance, but there are several studies that suggest human activities (machinery operation, hikers, motorcycles, airplanes) do not disturb Spotted Owls (to the extent that occupancy or productivity are impaired) and it would require an active survey program across the landscape to document owl presence.</p>	
167	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding tools to expect and/or management actions for wildlife: A) Emphasize a strong conservation strategy to protect wildlife, with emphasis on rare and endangered species, protection of all surface waters and restoration of natural habitats and older forests; B) Consider USFWS and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) recovery plans and critical habitat designations; C) Components related to species and ecosystem recovery should be grounded in existing conservation efforts underway throughout the planning area; D) Include provisions to maintain and restore functional critical habitat; E) Consider recovery plan recommendations; F) Use landscape analyses at appropriate scales to inform recovery plan and critical habitat elements in the plan revisions; and G) Strive to achieve habitat conditions suitable to maintain viable populations well distributed on NFS lands within the capability of lands in the planning area; and H) Ensure there is no commercial permittee (i.e., cattle allotments) disturbance in wildlife habitat.</p>	62, 244, 833
168	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding wolverines: A) Use the most recent studies and/or references; B) Utilize research by the Pacific Northwest Research Station and the Cascades Carnivore Project; C) Address the loss of habitat, habitat fragmentation, warming climates and the management actions associated with each of these actions; D) Reference the species specific connectivity modeling at a course scale conducted and referenced elsewhere in this document and any additional finer scale analysis that may emerge during the life of this Forest Plan to inform management;</p>	543, 599, 625, 857

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	E) Utilize the regional assessment of landscape connectivity that was completed in 2001.	
169	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding woodland caribou:</p> <p>A) Disclose whether this sampling of caribou guidance would replace the extensive and more detailed guidance contained in the current Forest Plan;</p> <p>B) Disclose management in the proposed new management areas that overlap MA2 in the current Forest Plan and how they will be different under the new Forest Plan;</p> <p>C) Restrict over-the-snow vehicle use within the Caribou Recovery Area.</p>	169, 675
170	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding wildlife:</p> <p>A) Provide protection for wildlife;</p> <p>B) Provide management for deer;</p> <p>C) Quantify the number of all listed threatened or endangered species including those proposed for listing;</p> <p>D) Identify the critical habitat for all listed threatened or endangered species;</p> <p>E) Prohibit management of wildlife and it will flourish;</p> <p>F) Provide for the maintenance or restoration of ecological conditions to contribute to the extent practicable to maintaining a viable population of a species within its range;</p> <p>G) Define viable population;</p> <p>H) Explain why sticking with the population viability mandates of the 1982 regulations is not feasible;</p> <p>I) Provide for viability of wildlife on the forest using the best available science within any newly created land allocations by providing an adequate array of land allocations and standards and guidelines;</p> <p>J) Establish a scientifically rigorous, systematic, and consistent approach for identifying species of conservation concern, which includes an open, independent peer review process;</p> <p>K) Adopt the use of focal species approach as outlined in the Committee of Scientists 1999 report;</p> <p>L) Disclose how and/or what proposed management actions would restore and improve habitat through objectives for selected habitats and species that can be used as benchmarks for implementation and include a process for monitoring;</p> <p>M) Utilize Gaines et al 2002 for assessing cumulative effects of linear recreation routes;</p> <p>N) Provide for viability of wildlife on the forest using the best available science within any land allocations by providing an adequate array of land allocations with specific standards and guidelines;</p> <p>O) Coordinate with other wildlife agencies to prepare management plans;</p> <p>P) Include strong language to protect existing species and those which may later be threatened by climate change, nearby private development, or other factors;</p> <p>Q) Review the Draft Plans, the Alternatives and the analysis to ensure that impacts to wildlife and other natural resources is assessed and disclosed in a fair and unbiased manner;</p> <p>R) Coordinate with grazing permit holders when those activities take place inside allotment boundaries;</p>	141, 288, 326, 398, 569, 595, 599, 625, 630, 636, 652, 711, 754, 838, 857, 875

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>S) Do not displace livestock or prevent them from efficiently occupying grazing allotments; when conflicts arise the wildlife needs to be moved or removed, not the cattle; and</p> <p>T) Designate more low elevation land for wildlife.</p>	
Non-Substantive (3e)		
119	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Forest Service received the following comment letters that contained comments that were unsupported opinion or a statement of facts with no stated request for action, and therefore, do not warrant further response: 17, 29, 34, 75, 81, 82, 113, 189, 198, 211, 258, and 310.</p>	17, 29, 34, 75, 81, 82, 113, 189, 211, 258, 310
Editorial Comments to the Document (3f)		
027	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in your public involvement:</p> <p>A) At public meetings/open houses: ensure that information stations are more obvious and set apart, edit data down to the most relevant information (maybe providing handouts available to those folks who want more details), present the information in a simplified and easy-to-understand way, and consider room layout;</p> <p>B) The technology used to provide information needs to be accessible by everyone, not everyone has the latest computer or top notch computer skills;</p> <p>C) Ensure handouts used in public meetings coincide with the Proposed Action. For example the Proposed Action lists 17 proposed actions for Management Areas and the colored handout at the scoping meetings (Proposed Management Area Descriptions) listed only five Proposed Management Area Descriptions. In addition, the descriptions regarding "limited vegetation management" don't coincide in these two documents either (see comment letter 200, comments 2 and 3);</p> <p>D) Post the following to the reading room on the Forest Plan revision web site and inform the public when they are posted: all technical reports as they become available; and easy links to relevant plans and documents including the Snoqualmie Pass Adaptive Management Area Plan, Late Successional Reserve Assessments for both the Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests, and reference to if direct links are not available to watershed analyses;</p> <p>E) Ensure timely responses are followed through in response to information requests;</p> <p>F) Ensure public outreach includes everyone, including national groups;</p> <p>G) Allow public comment at your public meetings; and</p> <p>H) Provide education to the public regarding use of the national forest.</p>	1, 60, 100, 114, 166, 326, 599, 659,
028	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding their collaborative process on the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) Allow public comment or small group discussion sessions in Spokane, similar to the meetings in Colville, Okanogan, and Wenatchee;</p> <p>B) Explain the goals, objectives, and expectations of the collaborative process; and incorporate the collaborative agreements that were a result of the collaborative process, which will help gain trust and support in the collaborative process from the public. In addition, design a transition process within the Forest Service as IDT members change;</p>	124, 508, 535, 585, 652, 706

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>C) Ensure that if the Forest Service is developing a synopsis of the collaborative meetings that it correctly captures the public's desires, intentions, and agreements; and that expectations (public and Forest Service) are clarified at the beginning of the process of how the outcomes of the collaborative process will be used in the development of the Proposed Action and EIS;</p> <p>D) Do not incorporate the data gathered at the collaborative meetings into the Proposed Action and/or EIS.</p>	
029	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding their collaborative process on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Explain why the original appeal of the current Forest Plan developed by the Okanogan Forest Users was never addressed;</p> <p>B) Do not incorporate the data gathered at the collaborative meetings into the Proposed Action and/or EIS;</p> <p>C) Include advocacy groups like the Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance in the collaborative process, and/or create a Central Washington Collaborative group.</p>	270, 530, 677, 847
103	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comments:</p> <p>A) Page 49 states ATV, motorcycles, snowmobiles, polluting, noisy, stressful on wildlife, trails recreationalists account for less than 1% but in a previous section say the opportunities could be enhanced; go figure! Page 51 states again unacceptable recreational impacts are likely to increase then in the next sentence hiking use is project to increase 78% (OHV is 0.6%);</p> <p>B) There is a comment in the proposed action regarding wilderness that "horsemen prefer wilderness". Where did this information originate? The great majority of horse activities are conducted outside of wilderness areas;</p> <p>C) Page 19 Addressing snowmobiles versus winter recreation includes the opportunity of recreation partnerships;</p> <p>D) P45 Add snow conditions as a factor in trail planning. Address climate change;</p> <p>E) Page 10 ignores threatened and endangered fisher;</p> <p>F) Items I-a and I-b page 34 "The plan would also provide direction to retain old trees and enough of the younger and largest trees to meet the large tree desired conditions; The plan would prioritize retention of large, younger trees that are in the best condition and are not limiting nearby older trees through resource competition": The words "old," "younger," "largest," and "large" need to be defined in the DEIS. Until such definitions are provided, it is difficult to substantively comment on these aspects of the PA;</p> <p>G) Overall, the Forest Service presentation and organization of the Proposed Action (PA) is disappointing. The contents pages (iii and iv) do not direct the public to either a section on timber harvest or on watershed activities. In fact, the contents pages would lead the public to conclude that no timber harvest would take place on our public lands, merely "active restoration" activities. This is not just hiding the ball, this is an attempt to hide the clearcuts; and</p> <p>H) We also request that the Draft EIS provide an historical perspective for the public and include the following information: The Wenatchee National Forest and Chelan National Forest were formed in 1908. The Okanogan National Forest was formed from the Okanogan County portion of the Chelan NF in 1911. The Draft EIS should assess the stewardship of the Wenatchee National Forest and Okanogan National Forest under the U.S. National Forest Service. With a century of "management" under its belt, what landscape changes have occurred on the OWNF in the non-Wilderness and remaining roadless areas? What has</p>	114, 271, 288, 309, 314, 326, 699, 800

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	happened to connectivity allowing species to freely migrate within or through the OWNF?	
104	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comments: The Draft EIS must provide an analysis of the history of forestry and irrigation. What group “pioneered in the theory that watershed vegetation directly affected their water supply? Forests, they argued, absorbed rainfall, retarded stream run-off, and increase the level of ground water: forests retarded snow melting in the early months of the year, reduced spring floods, and saved water for summer use when supplies run low; forests retarded soil erosion and silting in irrigation ditches and reservoirs”? It was “Western irrigators” who “played a major role in establishing the national forests and in defending them from attack. Throughout the [18] nineties irrigation groups petitioned, often successfully, that the president reserve particular watersheds as national forests to protect them from commercial use. . Irrigators constantly sought to improve protection of the forests from fire and timber depredations, to withdraw them from all commercial use, and to prevent timber cutting and grazing within them.” Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency, by Samuel P. Hays (Atheneum, 1959) (pages 22-23). There is a wealth of information in the American Forestry Association’s publications of Forestry and Irrigation from the early 1900s. Even the French Ambassador weighed in with support of forest preservation! Here are some selections: Forestry & Irrigation, Vol. XII – No. 11 - November 1906: “The Mining Industry and the Forests,” by Lewis E. Aubury, State Mineralogist of California (page 494): “That there is urgent need for more national and state legislation in regard to the protection of our forested areas, both from fire and the operations of timber speculators, is a subject which I believe is worthy the attention of the American Mining Congress.” (page 495): “One of the greatest causes for concern is the fact that most of the available timber land is in the hands of a few individuals or corporations. For instance, in California approximately one million acres is controlled by one individual.” Forestry & Irrigation, Vol. XIII – No. 3 – March 1907: A letter from Mr. David W. Cunningham, from Los Angeles (page 152): “As a people, we have a great lesson to learn: If we would have public interest cared for we must not leave them to private individuals. Most individuals have all they can do to care for their private interests. Public interests must be cared for by the public or, as a rule, they will not be cared for at all.” Forestry and Irrigation, No. XIII, No. 10 – October 1907: Editorial (pages 501-502): “Gradually we are getting our eyes open. The earth is the common foundation upon which all must stand, the common storehouse from which all must draw their supplies. Our natural resources constitute the raw material from which, by the application of labor and capital, all must live, if they are to live at all. The waste of natural resources is a public tragedy if not a public crime. The preservation of these resources is a matter of the greatest public moment.” (page 502): “In view of the fact that certain timber cutters, notably the pulp men, cut clean, leaving nothing behind them but stumps, and believe this to be the only profitable course for them to pursue, the question naturally arises as to how pulp wood will be cut when the forester’s ideal is realized and timber slaughter is ended by law.”</p>	326
105	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comments: Continued from PC 501: “The Fifteenth National Irrigation Congress,” Sacramento, CA, September 3-7, 1907, by Lydia Adams-Williams, Genoa, Nevada. (page 527): Address by US Senator Perkins of California, “Without our forests there would be no irrigation.”: “The Month in Government Forest Work,” (page 548): A report on jury trial in South Dakota fining Robert B. Bale</p>	326, 392, 466, 484, 547

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>\$100.00 and costs for grazing trespass in the Black Hills National Forest. "Government Irrigation Work During the Month," (page 552): [Hydrological connection.]: "California has learned, says the California Cultivator, not only that the ground may become water-logged by over-irrigation, but that ill-considered drainage and the inconsiderate use of water from wells may so lower the underground water-plane as to threaten the reversion of large areas to unproductiveness." Forestry and Irrigation, Vol XIV, No. 2 – February 1908: Editorial, "Equip the Association," (page 64): "What greater cause could appeal to philanthropy than that of preserving our heritage? What weightier obligation can be laid upon the conscience of one who has accumulated millions from "our boundless resources" than to aid in perpetuating these resources" Men give to the transitory; why not to the permanent? They contribute to small causes, why not to great? They build libraries; why not maintain the supply of material from which books and buildings must be made? They multiply colleges: why not recognize that, whether schooled or unschooled, people must draw their supplies from the earth?" Editorial, "The Pressing Need," (page 62): "We have the Director of the Reclamation Service pointing to the vast and beneficent work now in progress under Government auspices in the way of redeeming the desert and providing homes for the people; but averting, at the same time, that the continuance and success of this work are absolutely dependent upon the retention of forests upon the mountain sides, which in turn, is dependent upon National action." On December 18th the following letter was addressed to the members of the American Forestry Association by the Secretary, which includes the following (pages 77-79): "The only trouble with the movement for the preservation of our forests is that it has not gone nearly far enough, and was not begun soon enough," President Theodore Roosevelt. "In fine, when the forests fail, every man, woman and child in the United States will feel the pinch. And through misuse the forests are failing rapidly." Gifford Pinchot, Forester "In six years the Government has reclaimed 250,000 acres. . .The water for this work comes chiefly from streams rising in mountains. To maintain the supply of this water, it is essential that forests be maintained upon the mountains. To this end, National Forests are indispensable." F. H. Newell, Director, US Reclamation Service. "It is an absolute principle: no forests, no waterways. Without forests regulating the distribution of waters, rainfalls are at once carried to the sea, hurried sometimes, alas across the country. J.J. Jusserand, Ambassador from France;</p> <p>B) Forest Plan Revision, page 8 - This page includes a list of six primary decisions made in forest plans. Number six is listed as "6. Recommendations to Congress (if any) (36 CFR 219.17)." However, 36 CFR 219.17 does not appear to require any recommendations to congress. Rather, this subsection is captioned "Interaction with private landowners." Did the Forest Service intend to cite to a different section;</p> <p>C) The Forest Service's list of negative impacts from an expanded Bumping Lake should be made part of the DEIS. See comment letter #392 for its 3 attachments, one includes photos;</p> <p>D) To prevent the potential for any future misunderstanding, the PNSAA recommends that FS personnel clarify that revisions would only apply to new projects and new developments, or if this is not the case, detail the elements of the revisions that would be applied in a retroactive fashion;</p> <p>E) "Habitat connectivity - The plan will emphasize the need for habitat connectivity and provide direction for management</p>	

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>adjacent to crossing structures, such as the I-90 highway wildlife crossings under construction, to encourage use by wildlife. “ TYPO: This statement was copied directly from Okanogan-Wenatchee proposed plan revision obviously, since I-90 does not bisect the Colville NF; and F) Page 25, Discussion of Riparian and Aquatic Systems, the Proposed Action states that there is a different “paradigm for land management, moving from fish and wildlife being constraints, to vegetation management to integrated management of the ecosystem.” What does this statement mean?</p>	
106	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comments: A) The survival of species that depend upon the habitat conditions provided by old growth and other late-successional and mature forest ecosystems has been a consistent issue of debate throughout implementation of the original forest plans. We note that the Proposed Action states that public comments on Revision had expressed “concern ...about the definition of ‘old growth’ and how location and amount of old growth was determined” (p. 9). We are troubled by the fact that the Proposed Action and its Glossary fail to provide a definition of old growth; and B) We agree that sustainability encompasses “Meeting needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs” (Proposed Action Glossary) but reject the notion that it has much to do with “embodying the principles of multiple-use and sustained-yield.” (Id.) The meaning of sustainability goes much deeper, and that is why the Committee of Scientists (1999) took up the subject in great detail. The Committee of Scientists (1999) call sustainability “The Overarching Objective of National Forest Stewardship” and state: The national forests and grasslands constitute an extraordinary national legacy created by people of vision and preserved for future generations by diligent and far-sighted public servants and citizens. They are “the people’s lands,” emblems of our democratic traditions. These lands provide many and diverse benefits to the American people. Such benefits include: clean air and water, productive soils, biological diversity, goods and services, employment opportunities, community benefits, recreation, and naturalness. They also provide intangible qualities such as beauty, inspiration, and wonder. Yet, these benefits depend upon the long-term sustainability of the watersheds, forests, and rangelands if the public is to enjoy the ecological, economic, and social values that these lands can provide. Accordingly, based on the statutory framework for the national forests and grasslands, the first priority for management is to retain and restore the ecological sustainability of these watersheds, forests, and rangelands for present and future generations. The Committee believes that the policy of sustainability should be the guiding star for stewardship of the national forests and grasslands to assure the continuation of this array of benefits. Like other over-arching national objectives, sustainability is broadly aspirational and can be difficult to define in concrete terms. Yet, especially considering the increased human pressures on the national forests and grasslands, it becomes ever more essential that planning and management begin with this central tenet. Sustainability is broadly recognized to be composed of interdependent elements, ecological, economic, and social. It operates on several levels. As a collective vision, sustainability means meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. As an approach to decision making, it calls for integrating the management of biological and ecological systems with</p>	569

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>their social and economic context, while acknowledging that management should not compromise the basic functioning of these systems. (Emphasis added.) The Committee of Scientists (1999) correctly identifies maintaining ecological sustainability as a prerequisite for achieving social and economic sustainability, a prioritization that is missing from the Proposed Action. The capacity of human society to destroy the ecological integrity of the land places a high responsibility for stewardship on how society uses and protects its land and resources. In the case of the public forests and rangelands, this stewardship responsibility means that, in promoting the economic and social sustainability of communities and economies, the Forest Service must first ensure the ecological integrity essential to long-term sustainability. (Emphasis added.) Further, they recognize the dynamic interplay of natural and human systems, placing this RFP process in a context of our evolving scientific knowledge and social evolution—one that invokes collaborative approaches: Ecological sustainability ...assures that conditions are maintained that allow and promote natural processes of change and adaptation at any time or place, while the overall essence of the ecological system remains. The same understanding applies to human systems and economic and social sustainability; human systems change through time, and sustainability is based on the capacity of human systems to adapt and evolve.</p>	
107	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comments:</p> <p>A) The Committee of Scientists (1999) recommends that: ...ecological sustainability provide a foundation upon which the management for national forests and grasslands can contribute to economic and social sustainability. This finding does not mean that the Forest Service is expected to maximize the protection of plant and animal species and environmental protection to the exclusion of other human values and uses. Rather, it means that planning for the multiple use and sustained yield of the resources of national forests and grasslands should operate within a baseline level of ensuring the sustainability of ecological systems and native species. Without ecologically sustainable systems, other uses of the land and its resources could be impaired. We agree with the Committee of Scientists on the importance of promoting the dialogue on the terms ecological integrity and ecological sustainability in order to inform this RFP process;</p> <p>B) The Committee of Scientists (1999) discuss ecological integrity: Because of the unprecedented rate of change in ecological systems in the United States and the accompanying loss of biological diversity, environmental scientists have sought a way to measure or characterize the state of these systems. Such a metric would allow managers to assess the efficacy of their management practices in moving ecological systems toward, or maintaining them within the bounds of, sustainability. The concept of ecological integrity has been put forth by a wide variety of scientists as a way to encapsulate appropriate metrics, and measurable definitions have been proposed. (W)e propose that an ecosystem has ecological integrity when it can maintain characteristic compositions, structures, and processes against a background of anthropogenic changes in environmental conditions. Ecosystems with high ecological integrity continue to express the evolutionary and biogeographic processes that gave rise to the current biota; they have a species composition, diversity, and functional organization expected from natural habitats of the region; and they are resilient to environmental change and disturbance occurring within their natural range of variability;</p>	569

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>C) And regarding ecological sustainability, the Committee of Scientists (1999) state: Ecological sustainability means maintaining the composition, structure, and processes of an ecological system. The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) goals of maintaining species diversity and ecological productivity should therefore be broadly viewed in terms of ecological sustainability. That is, species diversity and productivity can be preserved by maintaining the composition, structure, and processes characteristic of an area. Since it's clear that past management has exceeded the capacity of the ecosystems, achieving sustainability requires a strong emphasis upon restoration. We appreciate that the Proposed Action highlights ecological restoration as: The process of assisting the recovery of resilience and adaptive capacity of ecosystems that have been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. Restoration focuses on establishing the composition, structure, pattern, and ecological processes necessary to make terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems sustainable, resilient, and healthy under current and future conditions; and</p> <p>D) Recognizing the importance of diversity of plant species, the Proposed Action is to restore "a percentage of unique habitats ... each year on the Forest over the next 15 years." (P. 30.) We urge that the RFP include a definition of "unique habitats," plus include quantifiable goals and standards that do more than merely "contribute to" high quality suitable habitat for endangered, threatened, and sensitive plant species"—the habitat must sustain population viability.</p>	
108	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comment: The anonymous nature of the authorship of the written proposed actions dated June, 2011 leaves the reader wondering who the "we" was and why some issues were heard and others not. This document does not use common professional writing tactics, such as foot notes, references, appendices, or bibliography. There are obvious omissions in the data presented. Examples of where the information is weak include: Page 9, Vegetative Systems. In addition to fire, citizens at the public meetings were concerned about private land timber impacts due to mismanaged disease blown in off the USFS such as mistletoe, root rot, moths, rusts, and beetles. Page 10, Plant Habitats. There is no mention of the weeds being spread by deer, coyotes, birds, etc. Private property owners see a huge impact annually due to wildlife spreading invasive species. It seems there is little understanding about the bovine digestive system and biologically engineered preferences. There is no mention that cows prefer grass to other forms of vegetation. Anyone dealing with weeds knows it is much easier to find weeds in grazed areas and perform better plant management in those areas. The best plan will deal with the grazing management issues and timelines. This would be one tool to actually accelerate weed management. Page 10, Wildlife Habitats. Concern from the public is that agency planning personnel do not spend enough time in all the various USFS locations to understand the micro environmental issues. Burned areas have little feed and high erosion potential and are very inviting to the new invasive species. Blowdown areas of vast proportions exist in some areas with other natural animal barriers and restrict movement of small canines, omnivores, as well as larger herbivores such as elk or deer. Thick trees lack enough water and sun light and are highly susceptible to disease. Sick trees such as mistletoed fir never recover and only continue to infect other trees. Discuss some new creative solutions to problems. Developing ideas like new wood cutting programs where citizens were involved in thinning projects (after chainsaw certifications, a basic safety quiz and signing a liability form) would benefit the forest and local people. Page 10, Threatened and Endangered Wildlife.</p>	606

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>“Good Science” is a subjective term and needs references. Page 11, Threatened and Endangered Wildlife. References to various animals are made, and as such a map of the small areas of impact need to be identified, rather than encumber the whole plan without reason. Page 12, Access System. No mention of how roads are used as fire lines, not just ingress/egress. No mention of how roads are required to support the economic development of timber sales, wood sales and personal wood procurement. Page 12, Livestock Grazing. It appears there is little understanding about the bovine digestive system and biologically engineered preferences. There is no mention that cows prefer grass to other forms of vegetation like sensitive plants. Anyone dealing with weeds knows it is much easier to find weeds in grazed areas and perform better plant management in those areas. The best plan will deal with the grazing management issues and timelines. This would be one tool to actually accelerate weed management. Omission of discussing major fire carrier fuel... “Grass”. Cows also help lower fire fuels. Page 12, Recreation. There is no mention of why the US Forest Service was created to begin with and there is no mention of the incredible dollar amount tourism brings supporting taxes for federal, state and local agencies. Once again it appears the economic impacts are unimportant to the authorship. In addition there is no mention of recreation management plans and spreading the use to less used forests with less sensitive areas, plants and animals. Additional benefits of recreation include: reporting illegal activities, reporting weeds, dead animals, erosion, smoke, and other new issues.</p>	
109	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comment: Continued from PC 505. There was discussion at public meetings of the monetary value of timber sales to the USFS. The income aspect to the USFS has been ignored. The high debt state of the nation it is important to tax payers. Let's see government not only saving money, but making money. Page 13, Scenery. No mention of creative logging or selective cut mentioned. Many private landowners can demonstrate healthy ecosystems that have benefited from this method. There are many methods in logging – some good – some bad. Page 14, Wilderness Recommendations. No additional wilderness or backcountry is desired. Better management of the current wilderness should be demonstrated. Item “d.” mentions primitive forms of recreation, which only provides a sliver of benefit to a tiny number of persons with no economic value to tourism and local economies. Page 15, New Information. Science is always being tested and in many cases bias, omissions and errors are shown to impact data negatively. Depending on where one looks for information, the findings will be predictable. New information needs to consider the state of the nation and future funding. Page 16, Overview of Challenges. A benefit omitted is the health aspect of providing physical exercise. With a nation of obesity and diabetes and escalating medical costs the USFS should be part of the solution. A threat omitted is simply the thickness of many tree stands, which do not get enough water, sun light and space to protect themselves from airborne invasions. Page 17, Ecosystem Sustainability. The USFS should not and does not have budget to accept any management activities not mandated by congress. Again, a specific map is required to identify the minor land areas impacted by potential federally protected species. Page 19, Fire Management. Additional issues are smoke inhalation, human threat of life, dead animals, and lost habitat. Page 19, Recreation. The USFS plan speaks of new science, which includes new data and yet glosses over the economic aspect of recreation and what it means in terms of dollars to not only local economies, but state and federal taxes. The economic benefits to the local, state and federal levels should be presented as it is a major issue. One</p>	606

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>mention of a special group was made concerning the Hispanic populations, and yet, a huge matter is the aging population and the ATV, motor-chair use and others for access in the future. The economic impact to all levels of economies in the US is significant. Especially with the current state of the national economy. Page 20, Recreation continued. The USFS allowed the President of the United States to sign the Omnibus Public Land Management Act which created the Pacific National Scenic Trail in 2009 which took away opportunities to the majority of trail users. In addition most of this trail was originally constructed with heavy machinery and was an appropriate trail for special users like snowmobiles and ATVs as erosion and wildlife impacts were minimal. Part of this so called trail is on Dry Gulch Road in Okanogan, County, Washington. Will it also be decommissioned for vehicles now? I think not and as such a president has been set for the USFS to reinstate snowmobiles to use the Wilcox area trail, AKA Road 100 Trail to Summit Lake Road. Really, ATV's could be considered also between May and September 30th. Page 20, Recreation, Climate Change is mentioned and the authors indicate that snow levels may rise to higher elevations. They may also go lower as they did this year. Hazard trees are discussed related to insects and disease, yet there is no mention of trees that are so thick as to not get enough water and light to be able to ward off the problem. Page 21, Access System, discusses a challenge when residential developments and private individuals are reluctant partners, yet there is no discussion of the dynamics involved with human resource issues within agencies which also impacts a relationship. The action plan is premature and no changes should be made to the current plan at this time.</p>	
110	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comments:</p> <p>A) The DWNA addresses recreation, and notes correctly that much if the use is from the "Greater Seattle Area." (Table 17). However, there is no definition of that term. If it encompasses Everett, Bellevue, and Tacoma metropolitan areas, as it should, the table needs revision. Some of the Wildernesses and PWAs are closer than the DWNA suggests. For instance, the DWNA (p. 11) indicates that the William O. Douglas Wilderness is within a 3 hour drive of Seattle. Actually, the drive from the center of Seattle to Chinook Pass and Pacific Crest Trail trailheads for both Norse Peak and William O. Douglas Wildernesses and the Adjacent PWAs is 2 hours, less from southern suburbs. From Downtown Seattle to Canyon Creek trailhead in Golden Horn (Liberty Bell) is 3 hours 10 minutes, but within the three hour radius from northern suburbs and Everett;</p> <p>B) Page 6. The Proposed Action (PA) document states that, "the DEIS will...display and compare alternative ways of managing national forest lands; and...outline the...social and economic effects of each alternative." COMMENT: We expect that the DEIS economic analyses will define a baseline level of activities in terms of full time and part time employment and personal income for each economic major sector of Forest Economic Influence Zone (EIZ) for the current time period. This type of analyses was not done for the 1990 Wenatchee Final EIS (See Appendix B, pages B-77 thru B-86). The 1990 FEIS "baseline economic analysis" was limited to the use of 1984 covered employment data which by its definition did not include proprietors, while the IMPLAN program used by the Forest in the 1980's was based upon local economic structure modeling from 1982 and produced data that included the effects of proprietors. Thus, the Forest's analyses produced data for estimated economic effects from management alternatives that could not be directly compared with actual levels (as defined by U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis) of economic activity. Furthermore, we expect the economic</p>	620

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>analysis for this forest plan update will compare the changes in economic outputs at the major economic sector level (such as mining, utilities, construction, manufacturing, retail trade, wholesale trade, for example) generated by the current situation and each forest plan alternative to the total level of economic output in each major economic sector for the entire 5-county regional economy;</p> <p>C) Page 6: The PA states that it will “...help set the context for the changes we propose...since the 1980’s...” COMMENT: From an economic perspective, we expect the FS to clearly show in the DEIS analysis both the actual (current levels of activity) contribution of the NF-generated outputs and the estimated Forest outputs by alternative to the current levels of activity in the EIZ over time as well as the changes within the EIZ between the period 1984 and 2009/2011. Our analysis shows that the total full time and part time employment within the EIZ expanded by 74,000 jobs during the noted time period (See US Department of Commerce (USDC) Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) Regional Accounts Data. See http://www.bea.doc.gov/bea/regional/data.htm). The DEIS must compare changes in NF-generated outputs to changes in the entire EIZ; and</p> <p>D) Page 7. The PA states that this document will provide more information “...about the proposed management areas, including riparian management areas,...motorized and non-motorized backcountry areas, active restoration areas,...COMMENT: We find that the definition for management direction in many of the noted areas raises more questions than it answers. We expect the DEIS to fully disclose the FS’s intentions in the standards and guidelines for all management allocation areas. We will provide detailed comments on what disclosures are needed later in these comments.</p>	
111	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comments:</p> <p>A) In the Okanogan Wenatchee Proposed Action (page 30) we noticed that road closures could be implemented to provide for desirable native plan communities. TOOLS TO EXPECT Plant management activities involve the establishment and maintenance of habitat components needed to provide for desirable, native plant communities. Typically these are accomplished through many of the same activities described in the vegetation section, such as natural fire. Additional activities can be actions needed to manage disturbance to plant habitat components such as road closures and fencing, and maintenance of habitat components such as snags, woody debris, and pollinators, and use of herbicides. It seems reasonable for the Final Plan to include direction for assessment of recreational value of roads, trails or areas that are proposed to be closed to recreational uses and, if possible, mitigation measures should be applied before closure. For example, this section (and all similar) could be edited to allow for such: TOOLS TO EXPECT Plant management activities involve the establishment and maintenance of habitat components needed to provide for desirable, native plant communities. Typically these are accomplished through many of the same activities described in the vegetation section, such as natural fire. Additional activities can be actions needed to manage disturbance to plant habitat components such as road closures and fencing, and maintenance of habitat components such as snags, woody debris, and pollinators, and use of herbicides. When considering road closures, recreational analysis should be conducted and recreational opportunity preserved via maintenance, re-alignment or re-construction prior to closure;</p>	636, 838, 850,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>B) Page 10, Threatened and Endangered Wildlife. "Good Science" is a subjective term and needs references; and C) Page 15, the USFS not only needs to restore the contribution from the USFS on listed 303 (d) waters, but also prevent/protect water quality on streams not listed in order to meet anti-degradation requirements under the state's water quality standards.</p> <p>Page 16, climate change – being more specific about changes in snow pack and more severe storms is necessary to acknowledge hydrologic changes to streams.</p> <p>Page 17, climate change – should add that changing flood attributes should be considered when locating and building any infrastructure on the forest.</p> <p>Page 20, flood events are predicted to increase in intensity.</p> <p>Page 20, Road access – again does not acknowledge that water quality needs to protected/restored – there should not be tradeoffs allowed for this.</p> <p>Page 25, water quality not acknowledged.</p> <p>Page 25, proposed actions – roads in any watershed, not just key watersheds, should not be presenting substantial risk to water quality. Further, the goal statement should not rely only on the phrase “substantial risk”. Road repair and improvement measures need to be taken with the intent to eliminate the discharge of sediment to water bodies to the maximum extent feasible. Clear statements are needed that shows the forest will disconnect the road drainage from streams and wetlands wherever feasible and use BMPs to reduce the amount of sediment erosion and runoff in sections of roads where disconnection is not feasible.</p> <p>Page 26, in the examples of Lower Chewuch and Nason creek, reducing sediment load from roads and managing stream adjacent parallel roads is important, but the USFS needs to also acknowledge that they need to meet the turbidity standard. No technical basis or site specific assessment is cited to support the reduction targets, nor is any narrative established to assist in applying the targets to match environmental priorities. Just saying that sediment will be reduced falls short of establishing a target to bring roads into compliance with state water quality standards and current best management practices for forest roads.</p> <p>Page 26, add to last sentence of first paragraph of desired conditions – to meet functions needed for protection and recovery of habitats for ESA-listed species and meet water quality standards.</p> <p>Page 26, it is important to acknowledge the state's water quality standards need to be met under the water quality bullet (i.e., Water quality meets state water quality standards and is within the range that maintains</p> <p>Page 26, under sediment, appropriate amounts.</p> <p>Page 27, in-stream flows needs to include - that will support aquatic life.</p> <p>Page 27, flood plain, include – including providing refugia for salmon and trout.</p> <p>Page 27, wetland seeps and springs, contains no statement on protecting water quality within and downstream of these sensitive sites or on maintaining the natural vegetative complexes.</p>	

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>Page 27, Tools to Expect, needs to separate the effect of budget limitations for restoration activities from preventive actions needed to address new actions. All new timber harvest activities, roads, and recreation facilities must be designed and management to meet the current state water quality standards and current best management practices.</p> <p>Page 29-30, under livestock grazing – and livestock would be managed so that water quality and riparian habitats are not impacted and off-stream watering would minimize the need for crossing structures.</p> <p>Page 31, support proposed action to shift to ecosystem restoration and forest health.</p>	
112	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following editorial comments:</p> <p>A) Page 32-34, structural stage distribution discussion provides no scientific basis or references and creates concern by including zeros in the accepted distributions for mature and old forest conditions. How this range would be applied at both the site and forest scale is left in question. Of particular concern is the lack of any clear discussion of whether or not these structural distributions created by active vegetation management would be applied to riparian areas. If they are to be applied then there is expected to be a conflict with meeting state water quality standards and providing for the goal of developing systems that will be resilient to climate change.</p> <p>Page 35-6, end of tools – Acknowledgement that use of pesticides must meet state forest practices minimums, label requirements and/or EPA permit requirements.</p> <p>Page 45, add at end of sentence at top of page – right-size road system based on what can be supported both fiscally and environmentally.</p> <p>Page 45, trail management, eliminating only 10 to 20 percent of the backlog of trail maintenance in 15 years is not very aggressive, particularly if any of the trails impact water quality – how much of the backlog is contributing to resource harm and shouldn't the goal be set to eliminate that backlog completely?</p> <p>Page 46, access and maintenance, need to acknowledge the need to meet water quality standards.</p> <p>Page 47, grazing actions – a statement such as this is suggested – Allotments will be managed so as not to cause or contribute to violations of the state water quality standards by ensuring livestock access to off-stream water supplies; and that fencing or other management measures are used to protect riparian areas, and water crossings are designed to minimize contamination of water.</p> <p>Page 51, roads and trails used by off road vehicles must be designed and located (and policed) so as to prevent damage to streams and wetlands.</p> <p>Page 53-55, merchantable wood, there is no mention of the need to provide protection to water quality and aquatic resources and no reference to the relationship of the riparian reserve areas to the proposed action or the level of active management that may be allowed within them.</p> <p>Page 60, a road density of 3 miles per square mile remains extensive if these roads are to remain active and require management. The description should address the extent that these roads will be used on a harvest-only basis and then retired, or the forest service should explain how it has the budget to manage the proposed network long-term while</p>	62, 547, 850

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>correcting legacy road problems.</p> <p>Page 64, roads and trails used by off road vehicles must be designed and located (and policed) so as to prevent damage to streams and wetlands.</p> <p>Page 69, example of desired condition in riparian areas, is too general to allow for consistent management and lacks any directive to ensure that management meets the state water quality standards;</p> <p>B) Page 70, Table 11, there is a conflict between the columns labeled “Width” and “Description”. As an example, the width provided for Fish bearing streams is 300 feet, but the description suggests that it could alternatively be set at the boundary riparian vegetation etc. if those features occur closer to the stream. It needs to be clear, perhaps by deleting the Description column, which the measured Widths are to be used to define the riparian management areas. It also needs to be clear that activities within these areas must be designed to meet state water quality standards.</p> <p>Page 70, generally slope distance is not used, horizontal distance should be used.</p> <p>Page 70, site potential tree height or 100 feet for horizontal distance should be used on unstable from the edge of the area of instability.</p> <p>Page 85, should acknowledge the state’s position regarding Inventoried Roadless Areas.</p> <p>Page 86, needs to acknowledge Part A of the travel management direction from the Chief of the USFS;</p> <p>C) Page 21, the Forest Service expresses concern that managing ecosystems jointly across the landscape is difficult when adjoining private landowners convert their forestland to non- forest uses. But if there is no infrastructure to support long term forest management because there is no federal timber supply, more private forestland will be converted;</p> <p>D) See the United States District Court for the District of the Oregon Medford Division decision (Case 1:10-cv-01212-CL Document 37 Filed 07/12/11 Page 1 of 46 Page ID#: 359);</p> <p>E) The plan would define and describe the role of disturbance agents (such as fire, insects, and diseases) [add: cattle grazing]; and</p> <p>F) There are a number of processes that contribute to the resilience and biodiversity of ecosystems at landscape levels. Fire and effects resulting from insect and disease infestation are obvious major [add: natural] processes that influence ecosystems; and</p> <p>G) Livestock grazing should be included as an area of interest in the Proposed Actions for Management Areas.</p>	
115	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following regarding maps and/or the development of new maps:</p> <p>A) Provide the public with updated accurate maps;</p> <p>B) Add section lines and other points of reference;</p> <p>C) Add trails relative to the proposed wilderness areas;</p> <p>D) Add maps that show motorized and non-motorized winter recreation use;</p> <p>E) Delegate authority at the project level to ground truth map inaccuracies, especially near the North Cascade Heli operation;</p> <p>F) Add the Annette Lake SIA;</p>	<p>5, 24, 96, 170, 466, 595, 606, 620, 693, 806, 837, 838</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>G) Revoke the map dated June 10, 2011 because it is unprofessional and lacks proper definitions for all management areas; and H) Update maps with land acquisitions.</p>	
Comments to Incorporate By Reference (3g)		
120	<p>The Forest Service received the following comments letters that contained comments referring to and/or indicating that they agreed with comments made by other organizations and/or individuals (incorporate by reference) and that will be responded to within this analysis: 153, 318, 325, 375, 384, 465, 488, 495, 498, 560, 561, 562, 576, 584, 590, 595, 608, 623, 625, 636, 659, 685, 692, 694, 820, 831, 832, and 838.</p>	<p>153, 318, 325, 375, 384, 465, 488, 495, 498, 560, 561, 562, 576, 584, 590, 595, 608, 623, 625, 636, 659, 685, 692, 694, 820, 831, 832, 838</p>
Management Area Suggestions (3h)		
038	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Active Restoration 2 (AR2) and/or Active Restoration 3 (AR3) MAs on the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) Include details and firm commitments for protecting habitat for focal species of wildlife and habitat connectivity for maintaining viable populations;</p> <p>B) Allow for mineral exploration in AR2 for the Bodie Mountain and Clackamas Mountain areas and allow access for potentially high mineral areas;</p> <p>C) Define how management areas AR2 and AR3 will achieve results for improved forest health, reduced fire danger, or sufficient products for the local infrastructure;</p> <p>D) Actively management with higher intensity in the Wildland Urban Interface, which is closer to homes and communities where there is the greatest risk of wildfire; while lower-intensity, ecologically focused restoration should occur closer to recommended wilderness and backcountry lands;</p> <p>E) Maintain road density standards as a planning tool but these density standards should be linked to scientific literature, reviewed, and be consistent with the goals for aquatic and wildlife management in the plan;</p>	<p>303, 408, 472, 594, 784</p>
040	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Backcountry Motorized MA on the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) Clarify designating the area that encompasses Mack and King Mountain, as well as Twin sisters, as Backcountry Motorized because these are heavily used recreational use trails and do not meet the spirit of the Wilderness Act;</p> <p>B) Develop a small camping area in the area along the Albion Hill road (Forest Road 2030), close to the actual trailheads.</p> <p>C) Do not establish buffer zones around backcountry areas as this will reduce access for all uses, and expose the contiguous forests and communities (including the Colville Reservation) to increased danger of wildfire and disease;</p> <p>D) Maintain all areas being proposed in this MA because some of the best motorized trails in the entire CNF are within this</p>	<p>287, 508, 585, 615</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	MA.	
041	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Riparian MA on the Colville National Forest: A) Consolidate access trails to the remaining dispersed campsites; B) Consolidate unauthorized access routes in RMAs onto stable locations that minimize disturbance to riparian processes and water quality over the next 15 years; C) Restore excess user-trails within RMAs; and D) Develop safeguards for effective protection of riparian habitats.	484, 858
042	The Forest Service should consider the following change to the management and/or allocation of the Nationally Designated Trails MA on the Colville National Forest: Close the Kettle Crest and Shedroof Divide trails (proposed National Recreation Trails) to motorized vehicle use (dirt bikes, motorcycles, ATVs, and 4WD trucks and jeeps) because the CNF is unable to monitor and manage this trail network and unlikely to do so with future budget appropriations.	484
043	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Research Natural Areas (RNAs) MA on the Colville National Forest: A) Maintain the proposed management of non-motorized use in RNAs, summer off-highway vehicle use and winter motorized use would not be authorized; B) Provide more details about the proposed management of RNAs for the Colville Tribe; and C) Continue with the proposal to add one RNA, Hall Ponds; however provide an explanation of why Thirteen Mile Ponds RNA was seeded with non-native plants and if it will be restored.	484, 615
044	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Special Interest Areas (SIAs) MA on the Colville National Forest: A) Provide more detailed description of the management direction for SIAs; and where overlap occurs with wilderness management areas, wilderness management practices should be the priority and applied in the SIAs.	701
045	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) MA on the Colville National Forest: A) Acknowledge that your list of endangered fish species is flawed and bull trout have never existed in the Kettle River; and B) Acknowledge that the efforts of the Kettle River Advisory Board (KRAB) are more effective than those demonstrated by the Forest Service in regards to vegetation management within the Recreational and Scenic river segments of the Kettle River.	790
046	The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) on the Colville National Forest: A) Do not add any congressionally designated rivers as it will reduce access, unless the use creates excessive erosion.	125
047	The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to the management and/or allocation of the Wilderness	484, 625

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>Congressionally Designated MA on the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) Need to enforce regulations within Wilderness and include a plan in the DEIS to address violations;</p> <p>B) Clarify the language in regards to "Fire, unplanned ignitions" to explain what is meant by unplanned ignitions; and</p> <p>C) Specify in the DEIS how the proposed management direction compare to current wilderness management on the CNF and provide an analysis demonstrating that the changes meet the letter and spirit of the Wilderness Act of 1964.</p>	
048	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) Ensure that these Wilderness PAR areas remain roadless, undeveloped, non-motorized, and are protected for future generations;</p> <p>B) Need to meet the demand for more wilderness areas and non-motorized recreation, while considering population increase;</p> <p>C) Develop a national management policy that disallows wilderness incompatible uses in recommended wilderness and potential wilderness areas to prevent wilderness characteristic degradation and reducing the possibility of wilderness designation (see comment letter 840);</p> <p>D) Do not treat Roadless Areas as defacto wilderness and aggressively manage these lands for economic growth in the surrounding communities;</p> <p>E) Do not establish Buffer Zones around wilderness areas as this will reduce access for all uses, and expose the contiguous forests and communities (including the Colville Reservation) to increased danger of wildfire and disease;</p> <p>F) Hold more collaboration meetings and consult with user groups to discuss uses allowed in recommended wilderness because there are priority areas for mountain bike use and other uses where a clear rationale and need exists for uses not compatible with wilderness designation to be continued;</p> <p>G) Develop clear and concise direction in the DEIS for the types of uses allowed in recommended wilderness, for example: some areas should provide for motorized recreation, some should be non-motorized, but not Wilderness so chainsaws can be used for trail maintenance and mechanized trail repairs can be made when appropriate;</p> <p>H) Disclose the results of the Wilderness Needs Assessment that describes the capability, availability, and need for each IRA, which then provides the rationale and documentation for more wilderness. In addition, consider designating areas with valid mining claims as wilderness would be contrary to stated Congressional and Forest Service policy (see comment letter 293).</p>	230, 237, 241, 249, 260, 293, 365, 405, 429, 472, 484, 594, 675, 840
050	<p>The Forest Service should consider recommending less or no more Wilderness (Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR)) areas on the Colville National Forest because:</p> <p>A) This MA designation reduces access for recreation, disabled and senior citizens needing motorized access, resource management, fire fighting, emergency rescues, use of motorized/mechanized equipment to maintain the trails; and creates unmanaged forests that are susceptible to disease and catastrophic wildfires, which result in loss of wildlife, their habitat, destruction of the ecosystem, and air and water pollution; but the designation alone doesn't provide a guarantee;</p>	40, 68, 71, 116, 120, 125, 179, 271, 273, 277, 311, 316, 358, 361, 403, 439, 440, 472, 483, 494, 502, 530, 572, 585, 601, 602, 604, 609, 617, 706,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>B) This will reduce mountain bike opportunities, such as in the Molybdenite and Dry Canyon areas, and these areas are ineligible for wilderness designation because of old clearcuts and logging roads;</p> <p>C) In Ferry County only 17% of Ferry County is private land leaving the rest intermingled with state and federal lands and a significant portion of the CNF is located in Ferry County;</p> <p>D) Areas being recommended for wilderness designation do not meet the criteria as called for in the Wilderness Act of 1964 or the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984. For example, the Bald Snow and Hoodoo area you can see paved roads and unpaved roads, see and hear traffic on these roads and in some areas see power lines; from Profanity and Bald Snow areas you see dwellings and at night see the lights of these dwellings; the Profanity area has a road traversing the entire area from west on the Lambert Creek Road to east on the Albion Hill road which has been used by horse drawn wheel vehicles for over 100 years; South of Highway 20 in the Bald-Snow proposed wilderness area there has been considerable road construction and logging activities on both sides of the area; and in the Barnaby Buttes area there is a road going from the Hall Creek Road east to the base of Barnaby Buttes (6 plus miles long) which has supported logging activity along the route;</p> <p>E) Wilderness designation restricts effect management techniques and creates catastrophic wildfire placing Ferry County citizens and their property at risk;</p> <p>F) Equal access to the CNF by all Ferry County citizens is important and necessary for cultural and economical purposes;</p> <p>G) Wilderness Designation would result in loss of land, grazing, mining interests, recreation, managed water supply, and timber production in Ferry County;</p> <p>H) Ferry County Community Wildfire Protection Plan has identified the hazards existing in the county and forest planning must take into account the efforts of this county has already undertaken to build a comprehensive local plan that is compliant with FEMA requirements, state growth management, and county plans. Wilderness Designations does not have a protection plan for our forest and private property;</p> <p>I) Ferry County Commissioners has Resolution 2011-25 opposing wilderness designation in Ferry County;</p> <p>J) Wilderness areas have too many restrictions;</p> <p>K) The 2009 NVUM showed that there were 362,000 visitors to the CNF of which only 1,000 indicated that they had visited the Salmo-Priest Wilderness (0.3%) that was year-round visits;</p> <p>L) More wilderness will have a negative effect on the local economy and put more pressure on private grazing lands;</p> <p>M) You should consider designating these areas as Backcountry instead to provide for a greater variety of uses in the future while providing protection for the forest resources;</p> <p>N) Do not close any more roads, we don't need any more wilderness;</p> <p>O) The roads to King and Mack Mountains have culverts (both open top wood and round metal), traffic signs, pickup trucks, and access to a lookout, therefore doesn't meet the criteria for recommended wilderness and shouldn't be recommended;</p> <p>P) No more wilderness from Republic to Kettle Falls;</p> <p>Q) Do not recommend Jackson Creek (#608001), Bodie Mountain (#608002), and the Clackamas Mountain (#608003) PWAs</p>	<p>798, 813, 843,</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>as wilderness due to their potential to host economic gold resources;</p> <p>R) Do not recommend miles of trails in the Selkirks, including excellent singletrack riding on the Gillete Ridge Trail, Bead Lake loop, the Batey Boulder trail system, and other multi-use trails; and</p> <p>S) Remove the Profanity and Bald Snow IRAs from recommended wilderness designation (PAR) and designate them as Recreation Special Interest Areas, as recommended by the Forest Supervisor at the end of the collaboration to protect the non-motorized recreation, scenic, and ecological values; and preserve the incredible opportunity to develop a robust recreation economy led by visiting cyclists (mountain bikes) in both counties by maintaining bicycle access on this important point-to-point trail (see comment letter #609 for detailed rationale).</p>	
051	<p>The Forest Service should consider recommending more Wilderness (Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR)) areas on the Colville National Forest because/and:</p> <p>A) Eastern Washington is bereft of wilderness areas and should have equivalent wilderness protection similar to the Washington Cascades;</p> <p>B) It should be similar to the Columbia Highlands proposal;</p> <p>C) Eastern Washington needs more areas for non-motorized use and better resource management;</p> <p>D) Maintain the recommendations for the Kettle Crest, Hoodoo Canyon, Abercrombie/Hooknose, and the Salmon Priest Wilderness areas, as well as the other 16 IRAs not recommended in the Proposed Action;</p> <p>E) Recommend all the IRAs for wilderness that were agreed to in the collaborative meetings and the Summit process, and these areas should be non-motorized;</p> <p>F) Review the wilderness evaluation, identify those IRAs that nearly made the recommendation list, and explain in detail in the DEIS the rationale for including them in the list for recommendation because there are substantially more acres of IRA/PWA that qualify for wilderness recommendation;</p> <p>G) Consider the following areas for recommended wilderness: 1) all of the Kettle Crest/Sherman Pass, including the Kettle Crest Recreation Trail; 2) Thirteen Mile; 3) Cougar Mountain; 4) Twin Sisters; 5) Hall Mountain; 6) Grassy Top Mountain; 7) Quartzite; and 8) Bunchgrass Meadows; 9) Betts Meadow area, south of Chewelah area; 10) Mud Lake/Horseshoe Lake corridor area behind Quartzite; 11) Roosevelt Grove of Ancient Cedars; 12) Mt Leona; 13) Entiat-Chelan roadless area; 14) Teanaway roadless area; 15) Liberty Bell roadless area; 16) Bald Snow roadless area; 17) Jungle Hill area; 18) Emerald Lake; 19) Snow Peak and the hut; 20) Profanity; 21) Barnaby Buttes; 22) Jackknife; 23) Owl Mountain; 24) Deer Creek; 25) South Huckleberry; 26) South Fork Mountain; 27) Harvey Creek; 28) Jackson Creek; and 29) Lost Creek (see comment letter 598 for detailed rationale for some of the additions above).</p> <p>H) Create a "delayed wilderness" category for IRAs that meet wilderness suitability but may need some limited restoration before they become "Recommended Wilderness";</p> <p>I) Create a new "conservation area" management area that includes Owl Mountain, Deer Creek, Jackknife Mountain, and South Huckleberry roadless areas;</p>	<p>35, 58, 63, 67, 72, 74, 77, 119, 122, 127, 130, 132, 136, 137, 139, 142, 144, 148, 155, 172, 181, 185, 193, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204, 207, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 254, 256, 314, 367, 373, 376, 387, 406, 408, 411, 418, 420, 427, 429, 432, 442, 484, 497, 498, 533, 539, 563, 594, 598, 609, 612, 613, 618, 620, 621, 628, 653, 660, 675, 678, 684, 690, 701, 711, 744, 745, 748, 750, 784, 802, 830, 840, 854, 890</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>J) Designate IRAs not recommended for wilderness and have no motorized trails as "Non-motorized Backcountry", and no new motorized trails should be allowed in any IRAs or near recommended wilderness;</p> <p>K) Maintain IRAs as roadless, manage consistent with the RACR (no road construction, timber harvest, or mining allowed), clearly state that no new roads are to be built in the IRAs, and reduce the current road system to "the right size", which needs further definition in the plan, but should explicitly state that the "right size" will mean a reduction in the current road network;</p> <p>L) Instead of recommending Bald Snow and Profanity PWA's as wilderness, recommend the following 54,000 acres of IRAs as Recommended Wilderness rather than the current Backcountry (including any portions of the PWA in Okanogan-Wenatchee NF): Owl Mountain, Jackknife, South Huckleberry, Jackson Creek, and Clackamas Mountain;</p> <p>M) Designate the following PWAs as Backcountry rather than Recommended Wilderness: Thirteenmile IRA, Cougar Mountain IRA, Hall Mountain IRA, Columbia Mountain Backcountry, and Sherman Peak Backcountry; and</p> <p>N) Maintain the recommendations in the Proposed Action; however also include the increased timber volume goals previously mentioned in the Kalispel Tribe comment letter, and the verification of the active management and restoration zone agreements of the Summit process as a condition to their incorporation because increasing wilderness benefits the local tourism and recreation economy, as long as there is a vibrant timber economy.</p>	
052	<p>The Forest Service should complete a more accurate inventory of all the Roadless Areas using a collaborative process; involving the user groups; and using the criteria in the Wilderness Act, the Washington State Wilderness Act, FS Manual, and FS Handbook, not just the FSH criteria because several of the PWAs/Proposed IRAs do not meet these criteria as they have roaded and logged areas, heavily grazed etc., such as within the proposed boundaries of Profanity and Abercrombie. This review must look at boundary locations and ease of locating on the ground, eliminating cherry stems (Profanity as an example), and exclude recognizable areas of logging and roading before any alternatives are developed for the DEIS.</p>	311, 381, 585, 659, 813
053	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) and the Columbia Highlands (Kettle River and Selkirk Ranges) area on the Colville National Forest:</p> <p>A) Designate the Columbia Highlands area as recommended wilderness for future generations; and</p> <p>B) Consider allowing mountain bike opportunities on the Kettle Crest even though in recommended wilderness.</p>	2, 13, 65, 227, 245, 246, 248, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 257, 258, 259, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 281, 366, 368, 369, 370, 371, 374, 397, 400, 401, 402, 405, 407, 409, 410, 416, 417, 418, 419, 421, 422, 425, 426, 428, 429, 431, 443, 446, 447, 448, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 458, 459, 589,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
		633, 696, 701, 702, 703, 709, 710, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 725, 726, 727, 728, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 799, 800, 801, 803, 804, 805, 807, 808, 809, 811, 816, 818, 819, 821, 822, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 851, 859
054	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Active Restoration 2 (AR2) and/or Active Restoration 3 (AR3) MAs on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Do not overlap management areas especially with the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) as 7 miles of the PCT are located in AR2 and that is not compatible with the PCT experience; therefore the AR2 MA should end at the PCT MA boundary;</p> <p>B) Do not designate the Mather Memorial Parkway along US 410 east of Chinook Pass to AR2 because it's a clear violation of the existing direction (from 1924 to 1990) and it appears the intent is to increase vegetation management within one of the most scenic highway corridors in WA State and the Nation;</p> <p>C) Define what types of uses will be less intensive than in AR2/AR3 but more intensive than in Backcountry and Backcountry Motorized management areas, as described in the PA; and define if this projects will be open to public review;</p> <p>D) Clarify road densities in AR2/AR3 because they are not presented in a coherent context and do not clearly show a link to current decommissioning and closure efforts or travel management planning;</p> <p>E) Clarify if AR2 designation will take the place of public processes in determining which existing roads will be maintained or obliterated in a given watershed;</p> <p>F) Do not overlap management areas especially with the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) as 4 miles of the PCT are located in AR3 and</p>	326, 377, 383, 437, 450, 474, 484, 583, 584, 599, 603,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>that is not compatible with the PCT experience; therefore the AR3 MA should end at the PCT MA boundary;</p> <p>G) Quantify the amount of active restoration, especially timber harvest, which is allowed in MA AR2 and/or MA3;</p> <p>H) Include recreation residences as part of the recreational developments described on page 60 of the Proposed Action;</p> <p>I) Maintain the infrastructure (roads and trails) within AR2 and AR3 because climbers and other recreationists rely on this access (see comment letter #383 appendix);</p> <p>J) Develop trails in this MA congruent with vegetation management and road decommissioning;</p> <p>K) Maintain the focus of MA AR2 and AR3 as vegetation management rather than commercial commodity production because it's consistent with the Forest Restoration Strategy; however clarify the goals, standards, and guidelines in the DEIS or in advance to ensure management objectives are met.</p>	
055	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following change to the management and/or allocation of the Administrative and Recreation Sites MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Do not overlap management areas especially with the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT), as 5 miles of the PCT are located in the AR3 MA and generally this MA is compatible with the PCT experience; however the PCT corridor currently overlaps 3 ski areas (White Pass, Snoqualmie Pass, and Stevens Pass) where there are conflicting management characteristics and facilities providing access to the PCT are obviously an important component;</p> <p>B) Allow winter access to recreation residences by snowmobile, except where expressly prohibited.</p>	377, 474, 833
056	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Backcountry Non-Motorized MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Do not overlap management areas especially with the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) as 29 miles of the PCT are located in this MA and that it is generally compatible with the PCT experience but unnecessary and counterproductive; therefore the Backcountry Non-Motorized MA should end at the PCT MA boundary;</p> <p>B) Complete trail work in this MA;</p> <p>C) Clarify the management of this MA because it's confusing; somewhat misleading, especially in regards to unmanaged winter recreation; and there is a definite need for a Backcountry Non-Motorized MA and more of it; otherwise develop a true Backcountry Non-Motorized MA;</p> <p>D) Initiate a collaborative effort between motorized and non-motorized users to address providing access for everyone for a quality recreation experience;</p> <p>E) Address snowmobile use (either allowing or not allowing) in this MA; and consider that winter gate closures have not been enforced, possibly leading to wolf mortality on the Lookout Pack;</p> <p>F) Incorporate all Backcountry and Backcountry Motorized MAs into planning for prescribed fire and prepare a fire operations plan for each large Backcountry or Backcountry Motorized area, much as has been required for each designated Wilderness area. For each Backcountry or Backcountry Motorized area, prepare an invasive weed management plan that focuses on prevention measures, regular patrols and mapping of weeds, and a schedule for control actions to eventually eliminate all</p>	308, 335, 343, 344, 345, 347, 384, 463, 464, 465, 474, 475, 483, 502, 521, 522, 523, 542, 551, 576, 582, 583, 595, 600, 605, 618, 620, 632, 677, 678, 679, 681, 707, 708, 858

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	weeds known to be in the area. Each activity should be prioritized so that at least the highest-priority actions can continue even when budgets are tight (see comment letter #620 for more details).	
057	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Backcountry Motorized MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Do not overlap management areas especially with the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) as 1 mile of the PCT is located in this MA and even though this MA is intended for a backcountry experience, motorized use is not compatible with National Scenic Trails and negatively impacts the PCT experience and is unnecessary and counterproductive; therefore the Backcountry Motorized MA should end at the PCT MA boundary;</p> <p>B) Consider reducing the amount of acres allocated to this MA and consider creating new quality motorized vehicle experiences outside of recommended wilderness and roadless areas because “overall OHV use is not one of the more significant uses” on the Forest (per Therrell 2009, p 24), such as Bethel Ridge, Lion Rock, the Teanaway trail system, Hungry Ridge, Granite Mountain, Lookout Mountain, Mt Bonaparte, and Goat Rocks (as noted in Therrell 2009). Specific to the Teanaway Potential Area, clarify, through consultation with motorized and non-motorized users (including mountain bikers), where motorized and non-motorized zones are drawn within the Special Use Area. For the areas that remain in this MA, the Forest Plan must be clear that the motorized trails in this allocation are not to increase, so as to maintain the quality of the backcountry experience that is desired by the motorized users. This is necessary even more so in areas such as the Manastash where the motorized use is clearly at capacity (Therrell 2009);</p> <p>C) Consider designating the following trails within this MA as hiker only because the hiker use exceeds the motorized use: Nason Ridge Trail #1583 and Miller Peak Trail # 1379;</p> <p>D) By allowing motorized use in this MA, the "high quality, semi-primitive" experience allocation is not correct and allowing off-road driving for ‘challenging, thrilling, exciting and entertaining’ recreation on public lands is not acceptable, and is destructive by its very nature;</p> <p>E) Initiate a collaborative effort to address top primary activities such as hunting and snowmobiling to ensure these activities are encouraged in this MA;</p> <p>F) Clarify the uses that allowed in the MAs Backcountry Non-Motorized and Backcountry Motorized as they are confusing, especially in the use of motorized vehicles in the winter;</p> <p>G) Analyze all PWAs using the 2009 analyses of availability and need (Therrell et al) to determine which PWAs should be designated as this MA because it appears that all PWAs that have any amount of existing motorized use have been allocated to this MA. Specifically, the analysis indicates that while the Manastash PWA is a very high priority location for ORV use, and thus low availability for wilderness, it is at capacity for ORV use, and it does rank high in wilderness need for habitat and wildlife connectivity. This indicates that this area should be managed to allow for continued motorized use, but at no higher than existing levels, and that it continue to be managed to protect its existing wildlife and connectivity values (in our proposal, we designate this area “Roadless-Other” which would allow ORV and mountain bike use to continue);</p>	184, 326, 474, 583, 595, 620, 699

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>H) Clarify the wording “vegetation management activities could continue to be authorized” in this MA; however to ensure that the values for which these areas are designated will be retained, much more restrictive guidance is needed, and “All Backcountry and Backcountry-Motorized areas must be removed from the commercial timber base and not included in computations of the Allowable Sale Quantity of timber”; no commercial logging should be conducted, and no roads should be constructed (which is in concern with the RACR). The only type of salvage logging that should be allowed is when it is needed to facilitate road access, and it should be limited to within 200 feet of open roads (see comment letter #620 for more details);</p> <p>I) Incorporate all Backcountry and Backcountry Motorized MAs into planning for prescribed fire and prepare a fire operations plan for each large Backcountry or Backcountry Motorized area, much as has been required for each designated Wilderness area. For each Backcountry or Backcountry Motorized area, prepare an invasive weed management plan that focuses on prevention measures, regular patrols and mapping of weeds, and a schedule for control actions to eventually eliminate all weeds known to be in the area. Each activity should be prioritized so that at least the highest-priority actions can continue even when budgets are tight (see comment letter #620 for more details);</p> <p>J) Revise the management for this MA because it is too restrictive to allow aggressive ecosystem restoration;</p> <p>K) Redesignate the following areas to Backcountry Non-Motorized: Lion Rock, Mt. Lillian, Red Hill, and Mission Creek because they duplicate the use on the Colockum State Wildlife Area and essentially surround the towns of Cashmere and Wenatchee with year-round motorized use areas. In addition, Clara Lake, Beehive reservoir, and Horse lake Mountain area are a heavily used non-motorized area, important deer winter range, and provide an elk corridor at its higher elevations in the Clara Lake area and should also be Backcountry Non-Motorized; and</p> <p>L) Analyze noise pollution impacts on non-wilderness areas from OHVs, snowmobiles, and aircraft overflights (including military overflights), which should include an estimate of the distance noise travels from each of the above sources at various decibel levels. In addition, establish maximum decibel limit for OHVs and snowmobiles, prohibit the use of any after-market muffler modifications that exceed such limits, and establish no-fly zones and minimal overflight altitudes.</p>	
058	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Riparian MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Do not allow any off-road, overland driving in this MA because there is extensive 4WD/ORV/ATV trails in the seeps, springs, and wetlands in these areas (see comment letter #484, photo attachment); and</p> <p>B) Manage RMAs in accordance with the Northwest Forest Plan (including its Aquatic Conservation Strategy), PACFISH, and INFISH.</p>	484, 620
059	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Snoqualmie Pass Adaptive MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Do not overlap management areas especially with the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) as 35 miles of the PCT is located in this MA and this MA is not compatible with the PCT experience, is unnecessary, and counterproductive; therefore the Snoqualmie Adaptive MA should end at the PCT MA boundary;</p>	474, 595, 599, 611, 618

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>B) Provide clear definitions of the MAs in the DEIS. Based on the assignment of MA types on the Proposed Action map it shows designations outside the congressionally designated Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area (ALWA) are specified as Snoqualmie AMA, SIA, PARW, Backcountry, AR2, Backcountry-Motorized, and WSA and because of lack of clear definition of MAs it is uncertain of the proposed management of the ALWA (see comment letter #595);</p> <p>C) Strengthen the standards regarding vegetation management (blowdown and salvage logging) and reflect large-scale investments in connectivity, while providing a commitment and deliverables to meet the goals of the SPAMA including road density (see Late Successional Reserves Standards and Guidelines);</p> <p>D) Develop target goals and benchmarks set over the life of this forest plan revision that meet the road density objectives of the original plan (see comment letter #599 for specific suggestions).</p>	
060	<p>The Forest Service should consider changing the name of the Experimental Forest MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest to Entiat Experimental Forest MA because it's the only experimental forest on the Forest.</p>	545, 620, 699
061	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the National Scenic Area MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) 10 miles of the PCT is located in this MA and due to the overlap of Congressional designations, it's appropriate to overlap the MAs because given its extended linear distance, the PCT must eventually cross some major roads and highways and while it is important to minimize the disturbance caused by these crossings, National Scenic Areas share many of the same characteristics of the setting intended for National Scenic Trails; and</p> <p>B) Maintain the MA designation for the North Cascades Scenic Area because it's appropriate and meets the needs of the users, such as climbers on Liberty Bell massif and Silver Star Mountain.</p>	288, 383, 474
062	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Nationally Designated Trails MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Maintain this MA designation for the Silver Falls National Recreation Trail;</p> <p>B) Reconsider allowing motorized vehicle use (between May – September 30) and snowmobiles on the Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail (PNWNST) because part of this trail is on Dry Gulch road in Okanogan County, WA and the president has been set to reinstate snowmobile use on the Wilcox area trail (AKA Road 100 Trail to Summit Lake road);</p> <p>C) Ensure direction for the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) is clear, precise, and easily locatable in the revised Forest Plan, especially for new project proposals within this area (see comment letter #474, attachment of proposed Standards and Guidelines);</p> <p>D) Clarify this statement on which trails this applies to: "Summer off-highway vehicle use and winter motorized use may be authorized on specific national recreational trails, depending on the use objective of the trail";</p> <p>E) Include the whole PCT in this MA designation, which consists of those lands mapped as the foreground area visible from the PCT footpath, designated alternative PCT routes and—as designated on a case-by-case basis—associated overnight use sites, viewpoints, water sources and spur trails;</p> <p>F) Clarify the proposed management direction and plans for the inclusion of the PNWNST in this MA;</p>	58, 474, 484, 699, 838

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	G) Maintain the proposal to expand two existing Wilderness boundaries to include portions of the PCT (see comment letter #474 for analysis of overlapping MAs).	
063	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Research Natural Areas (RNAs) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest: A) Maintain equal acres and trail miles for snowmobiling on other NFS lands if the Rogers Lake area is to be included in this MA; B) Maintain this MA designation for Thompson Clover RNA.	358, 502, 699
064	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the National Scenic Byway MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest: A) 6 miles of the PCT is located in this MA and due to the overlap of Congressional designations, it's appropriate to overlap the MAs because given its extended linear distance, the PCT must eventually cross some major roads and highways and while it is important to minimize the disturbance caused by these crossings, National Scenic Areas share many of the same characteristics of the setting intended for National Scenic Trails; B) Maintain allowing vegetation management and ORV use but reduce where possible; C) Maintain this MA designation for the North Cascades Highway as validated by the Ross Lake General Management Plan and EIS; and D) Maintain this MA designation for White Pass, Stevens Pass, Chinook Pass (also Steven T. Mather Memorial Parkway), I-90 (also Mountains to Sound Greenway), and North Cascades (also North Cascades Scenic Highway- congressional designation).	288, 474, 528, 620
065	The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Special Interest Areas (SIAs) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest: A) Explain why there are no existing or proposed SIAs on the Okanogan National Forest; B) Maintain this MA designation for Lake Creek SIA; C) Clarify the proposal for the Swakane butterfly area; D) Clarify the management direction and objectives for all the SIAs, especially for recreational access (e.g., Wildcat Wall in the proposed Wildcat Creek geological SIA); provide more complete descriptions of the SIAs; and where there is overlap with potential wilderness and recommended wilderness areas, wilderness qualities need to be a priority in the management direction; E) Maintain this MA designation for Teanaway SIA for recreation and manage to retain its wildlands, roadless, wilderness values, and unique landform and vegetation types (serpentine substrate); and allow for restoration to be a priority throughout the watershed; F) Maintain this MA designation for Naches Pass SIA for its historic values and allow only non-motorized and horse use in the area; G) Maintain this MA designation for Boulder Cave SIA and manage the recreational use to be compatible with the endangered	24, 97, 177, 184, 288, 308, 335, 343, 344, 345, 347, 378, 383, 384, 463, 464, 465, 475, 521, 522, 523, 533, 542, 551, 560, 576, 582, 595, 599, 600, 605, 620, 623, 632, 677, 678, 679, 681, 699, 707, 708, 755

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>rare bats that are in this area; use of the cave should be by guided hikes only;</p> <p>H) Maintain this MA designation for Tiffany SIA for non-motorized recreation, and the remainder of the Tiffany Roadless Area as Backcountry Non-Motorized to allow for mountain bikes on the following trails: Freezeout Ridge trail #345, Tiffany Lake trail #373, Clark Ridge trail #363, and North Summit trail #369;</p> <p>I) Maintain the Tiffany SIA as an SIA with an emphasis on recreation (non-motorized summer and motorized/non-motorized winter), scenery, and vegetation; and work with all the recreational users to discuss designating specific motorized and non-motorized zones within this SIA; and</p> <p>J) Maintain this MA designation for the following SIAs: Teanaway; entire areas from ALMA plan; Tumwater-recreation; Mather Parkway; North Cascades Scenic Highway Area; Tiffany–Botanical; Entiat Experimental Forest–provide for road removal and forest recovery of this heavily roaded area; Nason Ridge –recreational- retain, with overlays for wilderness and other roadless allocations; Annette Lake (recreation); Beaver Hill (Ponderosa Estates) botanic area; Boulder Cave–zoological/geological; Fish Lake Run–zoological; Goose Egg Mtn–scenic; Kloochman Rock–scenic; Lake Creek–botanical; Upper Naneum Meadow–zoological; and Naches Trail–historical (see comment letter #620); In addition add the following new areas: Art’s Dream–botanical; Cash Prairie–botanical; Clear Creek–botanical; Deep Creek II–botanical; Deer Park Springs Complex 1,2,3,4–botanical; Giant Helleborine–botanical; Swakane butterfly–zoological; and Wildcat Creek–geological; and</p> <p>K) Clarify the management direct in the Teanaway SIA for horseback use.</p>	
066	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Increase the facilities along the WSRs, especially at access points, to meet the needs of whitewater paddlers and other recreationists; facilities such as construction or reconstruction of bridges, modifications to layout of campgrounds and trailheads etc. (see specific suggestions by Ranger District in comment letter #587);</p> <p>B) Maintain this MA designation for the Cooper River and do not recommend it for wilderness because it’s an important area for mountain bikers, especially in the spring;</p> <p>C) Ensure the WSRs on this Forest are maintained and managed to keep them wild and scenic for future generations;</p> <p>D) Maintain the proposal of 13 additional river segments for Wild and Scenic Designation, as determined by the eligibility assessment; and</p> <p>E) Document all proposed dams that threaten the free-flowing condition of the nominated rivers because proposals for additions to the WSR system should be related to the goal of preserving rivers in free-flowing conditions.</p>	<p>80, 308, 326, 335, 343, 344, 345, 347,378, 384, 463, 464, 465, 475, 521, 522, 523, 542, 551, 569, 576, 582, 587, 600, 623, 632, 672, 677, 678, 679, 681, 707, 708, 839</p>
067	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Wilderness Congressionally Designated MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Maintain the Wilderness areas on the Forest because they are rare, untamed, and unspoiled;</p> <p>B) Be clear in regards to proposed changes to management of existing wilderness in the DEIS; however it appears the Proposed Action doesn’t propose any changes;</p>	<p>76, 177, 204, 326, 474, 484, 583, 699, 700</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>C) 277 miles of the PCT is located in Wilderness, Wilderness PAR, or Wilderness Study Area MAs and due to the overlap of Congressional designations, it's appropriate to overlap the MAs because these MAs are generally compatible with the PCT experience, with the possible exception of existing motorized use in PARs and Wilderness Study Areas;</p> <p>D) Clarify the language in regards to "Fire, unplanned ignitions" to explain what is meant by unplanned ignitions; and Wilderness should be the last priority for fire suppression resources;</p> <p>E) Use active management as a tool to attain better forest and landscape health in Wilderness;</p> <p>F) There is no language in the Wilderness Act of 1964 that makes it legal to adjust Wilderness boundaries for ease of management; and</p> <p>G) Provide in the DEIS the current acreages and percentages of designated Wilderness for both the Okanogan and Wenatchee units individually because one area may offset the other in amount of Wilderness.</p>	
068	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following changes to the management and/or allocation of the Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Provide easier access for winter, non-motorized users;</p> <p>B) Include management direction in this MA to allow established trails in Wilderness to be maintained by the use of motorized/ mechanized equipment, used in the least intrusive manner as is feasible;</p> <p>C) Ensure no net gain or economic loss when adjusting Wilderness boundaries;</p> <p>D) Disclose the results of the Wilderness Needs Assessment that describes the capability, availability, and need for each IRA, which then provides the rationale and documentation for more wilderness because it's contradictory in the Proposed Action and by recommending an area as wilderness it sets a precedent and becomes irreversible;</p> <p>E) Clarify the wording "vegetation management activities could continue to be authorized" in this MA; however to ensure that the values for which these areas are designated will be retained, much more restrictive guidance is needed, and "All Backcountry and Backcountry-Motorized areas must be removed from the commercial timber base and not included in computations of the Allowable Sale Quantity of timber"; no commercial logging should be conducted, and no roads should be constructed (which is in concern with the RACR)(see comment letter #620 for more details);</p> <p>F) Prepare and implement prescribed fire plans, when necessary, to restore forest ecosystems that need a more frequent fire return interval. Prepare and implement an invasive weed management plan (see comment letter #620 for more details);</p> <p>G) Manage all recommended wilderness and IRAs as wilderness to protect the wilderness character of these areas; however until Congress designates this area for Wilderness allow mechanized trail maintenance equipment, particularly chainsaws, to maintain the trails in this MA;</p> <p>H) Ensure that trails and infrastructure (bridges, drainage structures) within this MA are maintained;</p> <p>I) Remove this MA designation for the Burch Mountain trail in Pasayten Rim Adjacent because it's important to mountain bikers and horseback riders and they are the ones who do the trail maintenance;</p> <p>J) Disclose in the DEIS the amount of recommended Wilderness or roadless areas that is above the elevation that supports</p>	<p>11, 326, 540, 580, 583, 603, 620, 693, 700, 817, 861</p>

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>commercial harvesting, the acreage or location of all remaining roadless areas, and provide detailed maps and descriptions of all remaining roadless areas in the DEIS;</p> <p>K) Include management direction in this MA regarding collecting rocks and minerals; areas of concern to be able to collect are: Heather Lake for garnets, Timberwolf for quartz crystals, Liberty Bell (on the CNF) for quartz crystals, and exploring for collecting sites in the Teanaway and Alpine Lakes areas; and</p> <p>L) Do not remove any historical sites or old structures in this MA because it's a waste of money and there's no good reason to obliterate history.</p>	
069	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to winter motorized use (snowmobiling) in the Wilderness - Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest:</p> <p>A) Ensure that the regulations are upheld and snowmobiling is not allowed in this MA because in winter the boundaries become easily "blurred";</p> <p>B) Establish seasonal motorized closures to preserve areas for backcountry skiing rather than closing to snowmobile use because backcountry skiing isn't a significant activity until spring when access isn't as limited and in some cases there is no backcountry skiing activity in these areas; therefore consider seasonal closures for these areas beginning April 15 or when the roads are passable: Eastern Teanaway (Beverly, Standup, Bean, Stafford and Etienne);</p> <p>C) Move the North Fork Teanaway Sno-Park up to Stafford or Beverly Creek as there is little to no snowmobile use; a significant portion of the Teanaway is well-suited for backcountry but doesn't get used as much because of access (distance from the trailhead), and would provide access to Bean, Standup, Stafford, large portions of Beverly, large portions of Etienne, Turnpike, Fourth, and Hardscrabble drainages;</p> <p>D) Continue to work closely with snowmobile groups and individual to educate and support self-policing and enforcement within the snowmobile community.</p>	43, 44, 655, 780, 783
070	<p>The Forest Service should consider recommending less or no more Wilderness (Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR)) areas on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest because/and:</p> <p>A) Do not recommend any areas for wilderness on this Forest because: it reduces access for recreation (motorized winter and summer, and mechanized (mountain bikes)), disabled and senior citizen, resource management, fire fighting, and emergency rescues; doesn't allow for use of motorized/mechanized equipment to maintain the trails; creates unmanaged forests that are susceptible to disease and catastrophic wildfires, which result in loss of wildlife, their habitat, destruction of the ecosystem, and air and water pollution; economically impacts the surrounding communities; there is enough Wilderness in Washington State; and according to the U.S. Forest Service National Visitor Use Information (NVUI) survey data from 2005 for the Forest(s), fewer than 7.6 percent of visits were to wilderness areas on the Wenatchee National Forest and 5.6 percent of visits were to wilderness areas on the Okanogan National Forest and in the 2010 NVUI sampling, those percentages dropped to 6.9 percent and 1.9 percent for the Wenatchee and Okanogan National Forests respectively;</p> <p>B) There is already a backlog of neglected infrastructure within these areas due to a mis-interpretation of the Wilderness Act</p>	14, 16, 19, 64, 95, 308, 323, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 341, 343, 344, 345, 347, 378, 384, 389, 398, 413, 415, 463, 464, 465, 475, 511, 518, 521, 522, 523, 542, 551, 554, 555, 576, 580, 582, 586, 597, 600, 632, 635, 650, 655, 677, 678, 679, 681, 700, 707, 708, 752, 834

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>that prohibits the use of mechanized equipment to maintain this infrastructure; C) Do not include any areas for recommended Wilderness because all of the areas recommended for addition to existing wilderness have been formally "screened" against wilderness criteria at least 4 times (RARE I, RARE II, Washington Wilderness Act of 1984, and the initial OWNF Land Use Management Plans) and were found to be lacking in one respect or another.</p>	
071	<p>The Forest Service should consider recommending more Wilderness (Preliminary Administratively Recommended (PAR)) areas on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest because/and: A) Recommended wilderness preserves and protects threatened and sensitive species; benefits our local communities by additional hiking trails; provides a non-motorized experience year round; provides habitat connectivity and resilience to climate change; and by expanding the boundaries they would be along natural borders versus lines on a map; B) Adhere to the Forest’s Wilderness Needs Assessment, disclose the results of this assessment that describes the capability, availability, and need for each IRA, which then provides the rationale and documentation for the need for more wilderness on this Forest (Therrell 2009 et al)(see comment letters #177 and 598).</p>	37, 53, 56, 87, 128, 134, 152, 177, 206, 285, 299, 485, 569, 584, 595, 598, 620, 628, 630, 656
072	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in the IRA Inventory Process and the Wilderness Needs Assessment (capability, availability, and needs): A) Add “Day Hikes to Views” as a factor to be evaluated in the Assessment and then evaluate the PWAs closest to population center on the Forest for their potential to meet this need; B) Add “Opportunities for Young and Aging Populations” as a factor to be evaluated in the Assessment and then evaluate areas that meet criteria such as low gradient, easy access, and accessibility for their potential to meet this need; C) Add “Winter Non-Motorized Recreation” as a factor to be evaluated in the Assessment and then evaluate the following PWAs for their potential to meet this need - Devil’s Gulch, Entiat-Chelan, Goat Rocks Adjacent, Heather Lake, Humpback; Creek, Liberty Bell, Manastash; Nason Ridge, Norse Peak Additions, Sawtooth; Stormy Mountain, Teanaway, Tiffany, and William O. Douglas Adjacent; D) Add “Access Close to Urban Population Centers” as a factor to be evaluated in the Assessment and then evaluate the following PWAs for their potential to meet this need - Alpine Lakes Adjacent, Thorp, Teanaway, and Nason Ridge; E) Add “Underrepresented Landscapes” as a factor to be evaluated in the Assessment and then evaluate the following PWAs for their potential to meet this need - Black Canyon, Bethel Ridge, Slide Ridge, Sawtooth, Black Canyon, Jackson Creek, Sawtooth, Liberty Bell, Pasayten Rim, and Lion Rock; F) Add “Core Wildlife Habitat and Connectivity” as a factor to be evaluated in the Assessment and then evaluate the following PWAs for their potential to meet this need - Granite Mountain, Liberty Bell, Long Swamp, Pasayten Rim, Sawtooth, Tiffany, Alpine Lakes Adjacent, Entiat-Chelan, Rock Creek, Stormy Mountain, Manastash, Thorp; Devil’s Gulch, and Teanaway; G) Add “Refugia for Fish Resources” as a factor to be evaluated in the Assessment and then evaluate the following PWAs for their potential to meet this need - Black Canyon, Granite Mountain, Hungry Ridge, Liberty Bell, Long Swamp, Lookout Mountain, Pasayten Rim, Tiffany, Sawtooth, Alpine Lakes Adjacent, Blue Slide, Canyon Creek, Devils Gulch, Entiat-Chelan,</p>	177, 498, 598, 611, 620, 699

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>Goat Rocks Adjacent, Heather Lake, Lion Rock, Manastash, Nason Ridge, Norse Peak Adjacent, Stormy Mountain, Teanaway, Thorp Mountain, Twin Lakes, and William O. Douglas Adjacent;</p> <p>H) Identify with quantitative and qualitative information the following: specific resource needs being addressed; resource outputs and trends that define those needs; which specific areas being eliminated satisfy which needs; and compare the value of and need for the wilderness resource to the value of and need for other resources. The Proposed Action eliminated large PWA's from "availability" for recommended status based substantially on the mere "presence" of undefined mineral resources (particularly the Sawtooth and Liberty Bell PWA's) and vague reference to "mineral potential" is insufficient to meet the Forest Service's evaluative responsibilities to determine availability (see comment letter #177, 598, and 620); and</p> <p>I) The Assessment is flawed and the rationale that Washington state and the Forest have large areas of designated wilderness already does negate the fact additional wildlands need to be recommended for wilderness and it's important to maintain large areas of each ecological type (core areas) (see comment letter #177, 598, and 620).</p>	
075	<p>The Forest Service should add a new Management Area or modify Management Areas AR2 and/or AR3 MAs on both Forests to:</p> <p>A) Recognize and emphasize traditional commodity production; otherwise commodity production will continue to be underfunded, there will be continued loss of infrastructure essential to accomplish many restoration objectives through timber harvest, and potentially non-commercial thinning, prescribed fire, and grazing could be considered an adequate substitute for commercial harvest and consider:</p> <p>B) Recognize timber harvest supports economic activity as an alteration, similar to the alteration in the Proposed Action: ""to provide a recreational setting such as openings maintained for scenic views"; and</p> <p>C) Open more trails for motorized and non-motorized users.</p>	70, 547
076	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following change to the management and/or allocation of the Administrative and Recreation Sites MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Allow motorized vehicle use on forest roads and designated trails to access areas in this MA; and</p> <p>B) Cut costs, less management.</p>	70, 519
077	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Backcountry MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Consider all the volunteer work that has been done by non-motorized groups on the trails in the Backcountry MA;</p> <p>B) Clarify management direction in this MA for all uses including horseback riding (trailhead access and dispersed camping), winter motorized travel (snowmobiling and cross-country), mountain biking, fire suppression, and no new road or motorized trail construction, etc;</p> <p>C) Allow FS personnel, range permittees, and volunteers to use ATV's for administrative purposes, trail clearing/maintenance, salt placement and other activities necessary to maintain the areas for multiple use.</p>	24, 33, 73, 107, 111, 121, 129, 271, 488, 502, 599, 676, 790

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
078	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Backcountry Motorized MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Clarify management direction in this MA for all uses including horseback riding (trailhead access and dispersed camping), winter motorized travel (snowmobiling and cross-country), mountain biking, no new road or motorized trail construction, etc;</p> <p>B) Apply seasonal closures for motorized vehicles, if necessary, as weather and conditions permit, and done on a case-by-case basis (by Ranger District);</p> <p>C) Do not allow grazing, use of herbicides, planned fire ignitions, and OHV use in designated drainages where reproduction and development of species of concern (i.e., salmonids and gray wolves) is occurring or has historically occurred.</p>	24, 62, 362, 530, 536, 597, 655, 706
079	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Riparian MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Ensure riparian buffers and water access restrictions do not reduce the ability to use stock on trails or for fording rivers;</p> <p>B) Manage RMAs in accordance with the Northwest Forest Plan (including its Aquatic Conservation Strategy), PACFISH, and INFISH; and develop standards that provide that short-term reduction in water quality is permissible; one size doesn't fit all in regards to buffers (see details in comment letter #547 & 569);</p> <p>C) Decisions to conduct silvicultural activities in riparian reserves must be supported by a rationale informed by the best available science that the risks posed by the activity are outweighed by the benefits to riparian and aquatic conditions and species; AND</p> <p>D) Include a map in the DEIS of all the RNAs and their location, similar to the Mt Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest.</p>	520, 547, 568, 569, 584, 683,
080	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the National Scenic Area MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Coordinate with WADOT on management of this MA in regards to cross-country bicycle routes, spring snow removal for recreation purposes (Overlook and Blue Lake), and early season non-motorized winter recreation</p>	288
081	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Research Natural Area (RNAs) MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Discontinue management of these MAs to reduce costs to the Forest Service;</p> <p>B) RNAs should not be allowed in Wilderness because this could lead to proposals to build trails, structures, install equipment, mark trees etc.; and</p> <p>C) Livestock grazing whether permitted or trespass should be eliminated (i.e., in Wolf Creek).</p>	62, 70, 692
082	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Scenic Byways MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Maintain current Scenic Byways and management of this MA; and</p> <p>B) Clarify what "improvements" would be sought and how various public uses might be affected even though there would be</p>	70, 383

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	"no proposed changes to the current management of these areas".	
084	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Clarify if there are suggested changes to the management direction that would allow recreational grazing, stock fording, stock trail use, and road repair (particularly trailhead access roads) in those areas identified as eligible for wild, scenic, and/or recreation designation (within the ¼ mile buffer on each side of the rivers' segments);</p> <p>B) Leave WSRs alone;</p> <p>C) Protect the outstandingly remarkable values of eligible and suitable rivers and clarify the timeline for subsequent WSR plans and how WSR management policies might affect other public uses of these areas such as improved river access for boating and climbing access trails.</p>	24, 70, 107, 383, 787
085	<p>The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Wilderness Congressionally Designated MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Clarify the direction regarding limiting cleared campsite sizes (i.e., stock camps) in designated Wilderness, and how direction in the Forest Plan will coincide with direction in the Pack and Saddle Stock Outfitter-Guide Special Use Permit;</p> <p>B) Do not restrict day use in these areas because it is very low impact;</p> <p>C) Expand the Enchantments Permit Area to manage overnight use in areas such as Ingalls Lake;</p> <p>D) Include "sound" as an Issue in managing Wilderness;</p> <p>E) Develop a standard and/or desired condition that addresses the issue of group size as it relates to measurement of vegetation loss; define what is meant by vegetation loss; and develop and implement a monitoring plan (see comment letter #359);</p> <p>F) Prohibit mechanical and motorized uses in Wilderness to protect the Wilderness values;</p> <p>G) Ensure proper signage is in place to mark the Wilderness boundaries, especially when the signs have been purchased by the snowmobile community;</p> <p>H) Ensure standards are quantitative, time or space bounded, expressed as a probability, impact oriented, and realistic in measuring Wilderness quality; consider ROS because it's a basic approach to defining and managing wilderness experiences through indicators and standards of quality that can be used to sustain standards of quality over time (Wilderness Science in a Time of Change Conference. Volume 4: Wilderness Visitors, Experiences, and Visitor Management. Missoula, Montana, May 23–27, 1999. USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station Proceedings RMRS-P-15-VOL-4, September 2000); \</p> <p>I) Reduce the amount of Congressionally Designated Wilderness because not many visitors use these areas; and</p> <p>J) Ensure the congressional definition and the intent and spirit of the Wilderness Act are implemented; and consider for removal any currently designated Wilderness areas that are not or cannot be properly managed from this MA and redesignate to another MA to allow proper management and care.</p>	24, 70, 114, 184, 271, 338, 359, 483, 502, 508, 520, 599
086	The Forest Service should consider the following in regards to management and/or allocation of the Wilderness - Preliminary	24, 31, 54, 64, 80, 93,

PC#	Public Concern	Contact ID #s
	<p>Administratively Recommended (PAR) MA on both Forests:</p> <p>A) Clarify the management direction for this MA in regards to mountain bikes, snowmobiles, stock use, group size limitations, campsite barren earth restrictions, use of motorized trail maintenance equipment such as chainsaws, and number of human encounters;</p> <p>B) Explain the rationale why an area is being recommended for wilderness if there is currently mountain bike and snowmobile use in that area;</p> <p>C) The public may support recommended Wilderness but if Congress designates it as Wilderness, the support may not be there because of different, more restrictive regulations;</p> <p>D) Adhere to the management direction in the House Report 95-540 that came from RARE II to allow chainsaws for trail maintenance in this MA. Be consistent in applying the direction in this Report because the RARE II inventory for selecting qualifying areas for Wilderness is used by the Forest Service;</p> <p>E) Concern that where grazing is currently allowed in recommended Wilderness, it may be eliminated when the area is designated Wilderness; consider the economic impacts to not allowing grazing to continue in this MA; and develop a map with accurate boundaries of the IRAs for the DEIS;</p> <p>F) Climbers do not impact the resource and consider this when developing direction for number of human encounters;</p> <p>G) Do not implement the Interior Columbia Basin Strategy for this MA because it creates de facto wilderness; violates the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 - Public Law 98-339 - July 8, 1984; and at least three alternatives need to be developed for the “three” forests – do not combine the Okanogan and Wenatchee forests into one Plan because that is also illegal;</p> <p>H) Further analyze these areas before determining whether they should be recommended for Wilderness because access and management opportunities are reduced in this MA, and research indicates that the need is not there for more Wilderness, nor the criteria of these areas to be recommended for Wilderness;</p> <p>I) Change and/or clarify the management direction in this MA for the following management: fires because it’s a concern of allowing fires to burn in the Wilderness; vegetation and habitat for all species; invasive species (noxious weeds); vegetation for recreation (blowdown over trails); and address budgetary constraints in implementing this management direction;</p> <p>J) Consider converting abandoned roads into single track motorized trails in this MA, which would alleviate use on currently open motorized trails; and</p> <p>K) Implement regulations and follow-up on reported cases from the public of infractions within recommended wilderness (i.e., logging or other illegal activities).</p>	<p>114, 131, 133, 141, 143, 228, 267, 271, 284, 326, 358, 382, 383, 399, 404, 430, 479, 489, 508, 516, 519, 520, 535, 565, 596, 598, 620, 630, 652, 655, 687, 787, 839, 867, 874, 876,</p>

Appendix C – List of Preparers

This list includes the names of the individuals who contributed toward the completion of the analysis of public comments on the Proposed Action and who were responsible for the response to comments for each resource.

TEAMS Forest Service Enterprise Unit

Jodi Kramer, Public Affairs Specialist

Susan Ague, Content Analysis contractor

1602 Ontario Street

Sandpoint, ID 83864

Colville and Okanogan-Wenatchee Forest Plan Revision Team

Margaret Hartzell – ID Team Leader and Access/Transportation, Alternatives, Best Available Science, Climate Change, Cultural Resources, Management Areas, Minerals, Monitoring, Issues, Process and Miscellaneous, Scenery, Tribal,

Rod Clausnitzer – Plants

Bill Gaines – Wildlife

Deb Kelly – Collaboration

Emily Johnson - Aquatic and Riparian Systems

Mark Loewen – Grazing, Renewable Forest Products, Vegetative Systems

Tom Shuhda – Aquatic and Riparian Systems

Lisa Therrell – Recreation, Scenery, Wild & Scenic Rivers, Wilderness

Lis Grinspoon, Delilah Jaworski, Richard Phillips – Social and Economic

Appendix D – Project Contact Information

Colville and Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests

Forest Plan Revision Team

1240 Second Avenue South

Okanogan, WA 98840

Project Contacts:

Debbie Kelly, Public Affairs Lead, (509) 664-9247

Margaret Hartzell, Project Team Leader, 509-826-3275

Project Website: fs.usda.gov/goto/okawen/plan-revision

Project E-mail Address: r6_ewzplanrevision@fs.fed.us