

What We Heard at the Alternative Development Workshops

1. Do preliminary action alternatives address Rim Country issues?

- Yes
- Stream and waterways health should be an issue
- Economics issue most important
- Ideas for burned over areas
- Aggressive use of natural ignitions
- More focus on brush component
- Support thinning
- More aggressive mechanical thinning and higher intensity to lower BA
- Smoke not an issue. Controlled vs. mega fire.
- Maximize treatment acres.
- Retain habitat for all species (or provide).
- Take actions to make forests resilient to fire.
- Watershed restoration protection not clearly included in Alts.
- Fewer temp. roads (minimize).
- Brush treatments need to be addressed under the alts.

2. Are preliminary action alternatives reasonable options?

- Yes
- Alternative 2 tries to accomplish too much—successful implementation not demonstrated
- Consider portable mills for economic feasibility
- If retain large trees
- Not enough industry or fire to treat 950k. Gives public unrealistic expectations.
- Leave dense areas on W slopes near riparian areas, because it will dry them out. Concerned that it will take away bedding areas.
- Consider using meat goats to graze down ladder fuels instead of burning to reduce smoke effects.
- Would like to see greater emphasis on economic viability in Alt. 3 (but not the driver!).
- Will be a mistake to just treat the easy acres, leaving other areas vulnerable.

3. Represent a range of reasonable alternatives?

- Yes
- Appreciate Alternative 2's emphasis on stream restoration, watershed health

4. Are the alternatives distinguishable from each other?

- Yes
- More detail will make give them more separation
- Difference in degree between Alts 2 & 3

5. Are they realistic?

- Yes
- Alternative 4 more so than Alternative 2 (too ambitious)
- Depends on economic viability
- Alternative 3 most realistic
- Alternative 3 may not be viable with amount of small diameter trees
- Coordinate grazing to allow for underburns
- How can Alt. 4 optimize both cost/economics & restoration at the same time?
- Is Alt. #3 even possible, given the challenge of contracting?

6. Requirements and constraints requested.

- Maximize waterway protection and enhancement
- Water quality standards
- Prioritize areas for treatment
- Save trees off value to wildlife
- Informational signs at landings
- Proper silt and sedimentation control on roads, FS contract supervision
- Ability to modify during implementation
- Clarify constraints on ability to sell lumber/biomass
- Timeframe to accomplish each alternative
- Retain large trees
- Keep long-term industry viable
- Mechanical thinning in sensitive areas (I.e., near communities) instead of Rx.
- Preserve & repair trails
- Need to avoid adverse effects to trails from log landings, skid trails; needs to be monitored!
- Burning vs. water contamination: How to keep charcoal etc. out of streams and municipal water.
- Wildlife and aquatics are economically important: use mitigation and BMPs.
- Prioritizing/protection of wildfire around towns: Fire wise WUI treatments, minimizing slash piles timelines through burning (shortening time).
- Mitigation for sedimentation (temp roads): work w/ contractors for mitigation, reduction/plan for spill potentials.
- Clarify meaning of temp roads & what happens once it's done.

- Mitigation for cultural resources.

Other Topics

- Speed up the process
- Make Cragin Reservoir highest priority
- Address City of Winslow Council re: watershed effects
- Has the FS considered how the large amt. of biomass produced will affect markets or competition outside the Rim Country footprint?
- Will it provide a sustainable supply or result in a boom/bust?
- Restoration needs to be the driving force, not biomass or timber products.
- Prioritize to treat to protect the highest resource values (for example: cult Uralic, riparian, wildlife, T&E species).
- Go for highest ecological bang for the buck, not economic.
- Include bark beetle and fire kill in NEPA to allow faster treatment – flexible toolbox.