

## Section One: Decision-Making Process

| <b>DECISION-MAKING AND MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>PC 360</b>                                    | <b>The Forest should consider using advisory committees to provide accountability and modification as needed.</b>   |
| Response:  | Accountability and modification are provided for in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan in Chapter IV of the Proposed and Final Revised Plans. The use of advisory committees is not out of the realm of possibility but is beyond the scope of this plan revision.  |
| <b>PC 128</b>                                    | <b>The Forest should revise the Forest Plan according to its professional abilities, and not according to the most number of responses for a given issue.</b>   |
| Response:  | We have used our professional abilities to design a Revised Plan and analyze the effects of different management alternatives, but we have also listened to all segments of the public as to what should be in the plan and how the Forest should be managed.   |
| <b>PC 54</b>                                     | <b>The Forest should keep greed out of the planning process, because you can grow forests and produce timber at the same time.</b>  |
| Response:  | We agree that we can grow forests and produce timber simultaneously. We do not believe we have used greed in the planning process. See also response to PC 256.   |
| <b>PC 256</b>                                    | <b>The Forest should acknowledge that the Forest belongs to the people and not special interests.</b>   |
| Response:  | The Forest belongs to the people and is managed for the people, but the people who use or support the Forest include a wide variety of interests, and the Congress that represents the people has decided that National Forests are to feature multiple uses and provide a wide variety of goods and services and opportunities. We have tried to reflect that mandate in the Revised Forest Plan. This is not a plan for special interests, but it is a plan that will provide jobs and income as an offshoot of vegetation management for habitat diversity and sustainable mast production. It is a plan that will provide jobs and income as an offshoot of producing and storing natural gas for the country's energy needs. It is a plan that will also provide abundant recreational opportunities, from driving for pleasure to hiking in Wilderness. And it is a plan will help conserve or enhance the natural biodiversity of this special area. |
| <b>PC 420</b>                                    | <b>The Forest should consider that Americans favor the conservation and preservation of wild areas even if they cannot personally visit them.</b>   |
| Response:  | We believe that the Forest provides many benefits to the country that are appreciated by people who cannot or choose not to visit the area.   |
| <b>PC 177</b>                                    | <b>The Forest should follow the Wilderness Society's guidelines in forming its management plans.</b>  |
| Response:  | The Forest must follow direction that is provided by law, regulation, and agency policy, as opposed to guidelines proposed by private organizations or individuals. In some cases, we have been able to adjust Plan direction based on suggestions from organizations or individuals, but in other cases we have not. However, all the comments and suggestions we have received have been considered.  |
| <b>PC 204</b>                                    | <b>The Forest should address long-range management issues that are not ecological in nature.</b>  |
| PC 204a  | <b>INCLUDING LONG-TERM PLANS TO ACQUIRE NON-FOREST LANDS FROM PRIVATE OWNERS</b>  |
| Response:  | Land exchange and acquisition direction is provided in the Lands and Special Uses section of Chapter II of the Revised Forest Plan. This direction is intended to last as long as any other in the Plan.  |
| PC 204b  | <b>INCLUDING LONG-TERM PLANS TO MANIPULATE NON-FOREST USES OR EDUCATE ADJOINING LAND OWNERS IN WHAT IS THE RIGHT THING TO DO</b>  |
| Response:  | We do not have the authority to manipulate non-Forest uses or tell adjacent land owners what to do. We do provide educational materials to the public in many forms, including the Revised Forest Plan and accompanying EIS.  |
| <b>PC 235</b>                                    | <b>The Forest should run itself more like a business, including assigning a monetary value to each desired condition or outcome, and using economic efficiency tools.</b>   |
| Response:  | The Forest Service is not a business, as stated on page 3-456 of the DEIS. We do not have the same goals or objectives, nor do we operate under the same rules and regulations as does private business. We have assigned monetary values to our projected outcomes in the economic analysis, and the economic efficiency tools we used are summarized on page 3-456.   |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| <b>PC 384</b> | <b>The Forest should present a balance between various disciplines in the Plan because the Plan seems to over-represent commodity and game interests while under-representing conservation biology interests.</b>   |
| Response:     | We believe conservation biology concerns are well-represented in the Revised Plan. Land allocations create Minimum Dynamic Area reserves totaling more than 40 percent of the Forest. Another substantial portion of the Forest consists of smaller parcels of land not suitable for scheduled commercial harvest, which leaves only about a little over one third of the Forest where commodity production and game management are emphasized.   |
| <b>PC 644</b> | <b>The Forest should consider the benefits of the non-extractive uses of the forest.</b>  |
| Response:     | We have considered these benefits and uses. See Chapter 3 of the EIS, particularly sections addressing Recreation and Wilderness, Scenic Environment, Air Quality, Soil Resource, Water, Riparian and Aquatic Resources, Terrestrial Ecosystem Diversity, Terrestrial Species Viability, Terrestrial MIS and Other Species of Interest, and Threatened and Endangered Species. See also the Revised Forest Plan, Chapters II and III. Commodity extraction occurs primarily through timber and mineral management; however, these are only two of the many programs that we manage on the Forest.   |
| <b>PC 642</b> | <b>The Forest should examine what non-motorized and non-consumptive uses of the forest are occurring.</b>   |
| Response:     | Non-motorized, non-consumptive recreation uses of the Forest are generally described in the Current Condition portion of the Recreation and Wilderness section of Chapter 3 in the EIS. National Visitor Use Monitoring was completed on the Forest From October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003, and it included non-motorized and non-consumptive recreational uses that are occurring on the forest. See Table RE-5. Most Popular Recreation Activities on the Forest (DEIS, p 3-370). Trends and needs will be more discernible as use monitoring continues into the future. General effects from other management activities are described on pages 3-377 to 3-379 of the DEIS. See also response to PC 644. |
| <b>PC 628</b> | <b>The Forest should not use an adaptive management approach.</b>   |
| Response:     | Adaptive management is an approach that the Forest Service has adopted nationwide, one that will allow Forest managers to adapt to changing conditions, direction, needs, and public desires more efficiently and effectively over time. This strategy will put more emphasis on monitoring, which we have reflected in Chapter IV of the Revised Plan, and in the Monitoring Implementation Guide we are developing. We feel that the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan in the Revised Plan is stronger and more adaptable than the monitoring in the 1986 Plan.  |
| <b>PC 627</b> | <b>The Forest should incorporate an adaptive management approach.</b>   |
| Response:     | We agree. See also response to PC 628.  |
| <b>PC 159</b> | <b>The Forest should hire people that have a thorough understanding of forestry.</b>  |
| Response:     | The Forest hires foresters that have a thorough understanding of forestry, and the Forest hires other specialists that have a thorough understanding of their disciplines. It is our understanding and experience that foresters and other specialists typically receive education and training that expose them to many different scientific disciplines. We feel that type of well-rounded education and experience is a beneficial attribute for Forest managers to have.  |
| <b>PC 375</b> | <b>The Forest should manage the Forest for multiple uses, including timber production and recreation.</b>   |
| Response:     | We agree, and we support the concept, requirement, and implementation of multiple-use management.   |
| <b>PC 585</b> | <b>The Forest should carry out multiple-use management based upon the capacity of the land and needs and well-being of the communities it can reasonably support.</b>   |
| Response:     | We share your concern about the well-being of local communities and the need for multiple-use management. However, we are also required to look beyond the capacity of the land for production and consider the suitability of the land for certain uses given the wide range of resources and activities we manage.  |
| <b>PC 590</b> | <b>The Forest should not subordinate the production of goods and services to other activities in order to assure desired outcomes.</b>  |
| Response:     | Not all production of goods and services is tied to the desired outcomes for restoration or maintenance of vegetation and watershed conditions, as cited in the comments. However, timber production is closely tied to achieving the desired conditions and outcomes related to vegetation management, and we believe it should be.  |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| <b>PC 101</b>  | <b>The Forest Service should manage the Forest as a working forest to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a healthy and diverse ecosystem</li> <li>• Improve the economy of West Virginia</li> <li>• Increase timber harvest</li> <li>• Control disease, infestations, and invasive plants.</li> </ul>  |
| Response:      | We agree that the Forest should manage vegetation for many reasons, including those that you specifically state. However, we manage many other resources as well, and therefore we have developed management alternatives that provide a range of goods, services, settings, and opportunities.  |
| <b>PC 223</b>  | <b>The Forest should get the most out of all its resources in a sustainable manner.</b>  |
| Response:      | The Revised Forest Plan provides for a mix of Forest resources and uses.   |
| <b>PC 223a</b> | <b>BECAUSE THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER WILL NEVER BE RETURNED TO HOW IT WAS 100 TO 150 YEARS AGO</b>   |
| Response:      | We are not managing the landscape to return the entire Forest to how it was 100 to 150 years ago. We agree that much has changed in the interim and that such a strategy would preclude many multiple-use goals and objectives that are part of our legal mandate. However, ecological restoration is also a legitimate multiple-use goal. Therefore, in many areas of the Forest, we are allowing natural resources to continue to recover from the impacts that occurred 70-120 years ago.   |
| <b>PC 223b</b> | <b>TO PROVIDE FOR THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL NEEDS OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES</b>  |
| Response:      | The Social and Economic Environment section in Chapter 3 of the EIS describes how the alternatives would contribute to local economies and social effects.   |
| <b>PC 223c</b> | <b>INCLUDING SUFFICIENT DETAIL TO LIMIT LOCAL DISCRETION</b>   |
| Response:      | Limiting local discretion is not a specific management goal or objective of the Forest.  |
| <b>PC 223d</b> | <b>INCLUDING LOOKING AT POTENTIAL TIMBER PRODUCTS AND WHETHER THOSE PRODUCTS ARE AN APPROPRIATE USE OF THE FOREST OR JUST CONTRIBUTING TO FOREST DEGRADATION</b>   |
| Response:      | People recreating on the Forest may not feel that wood products are the most appropriate use of trees while they are recreating, but we believe that wood production is one of many appropriate uses of the Forest, and one that has short-term and long-term positive effects on people and the human environments in which they live. It is also part of our mandate under the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act and the National Forest Management Act.  |
| <b>PC 825</b>  | <b>The Forest should provide goods and services that cannot be provided by private lands.</b>  |
| Response:      | We do not have any goods and services that cannot be provided by private lands, but all of the goods and services on the Forest can contribute to those that are also produced on private lands for the overall benefit of the public. See also response to PC 698.  |
| <b>PC 586</b>  | <b>The Forest should take into account the severe limitations on commodity production that characterizes most Federal lands when determining the appropriate use of Forest lands.</b>  |
| Response:      | Certain federal lands, like National Parks, do have more limitations on commodity production than National Forests. However, National Forests have their limitations as well. Our limitations are described by management direction in Chapters II and III of the Revised Forest Plan. In particular, see the management direction for Timber Resources, Mineral Resources, and Range Resources. We do not feel that these limitations are “severe” given our responsibility to protect non-commodity resources defined by the various laws, regulations, and policies under which we operate. |
| <b>PC 704</b>  | <b>The Forest should examine how increasing environmental awareness affects public interest and use of the forest.</b>   |
| Response:      | We recognize that the public uses the Forest in many other ways than commodity production. Some of these uses and interests are captured in the Recreation and Wilderness section of Chapter 3 in the EIS.   |
| <b>PC 158</b>  | <b>The Forest should not subsidize logging or mining on public lands.</b>  |
| Response:      | We acknowledge your preferences. Timber sales on the Forest are appraised based on market conditions and past timber sales and then sold through the sealed bid process. There is presently no mining on the Forest. Coal mining ceased on the Forest in the early 1990s, and no coal mine permit applications on National Forest System land are pending or known to exist (DEIS, page 3-347). Should mining be proposed, the Forest would process the proposal and administer operations according to  |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
|               | authorities granted through the mineral deed, law, and regulation, and agency policies and directives.   |
| <b>PC 329</b> | <b>The Forest should address the value of demonstrating good forest management practices to the public that could be applied to private land.</b>  |
| Response:     | The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, in section 2 paragraphs (5) and (6), states the federal government and the Forest Service “should be a catalyst to encourage and assist” private forest landowners in the “efficient long term use and improvement of these lands...consistent with the principles of sustained yield and multiple use”, and “the Forest Service...has both a responsibility and opportunity to be a leader...”. Management activities on national forest lands are often used as examples of good land stewardship practices for other government land management agencies as well as private and industry forest landowners, at the local, state, national, and international levels. |

| <b>PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT</b> |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>PC 631</b>             | <b>The Forest should play a more active role in community planning.</b>  |
| Response:                 | We feel that we have had positive interaction with local communities during Forest Plan revision. Outside of revision, we coordinate and cooperate with local communities in a number of mutually beneficial activities. However, we also recognize that there are limitations to our authority and influence in community planning efforts.   |
| <b>PC 118</b>             | <b>The Forest should acknowledge that allowing the Responsible Official to limit the plan alternatives without public comment may be illegal</b>   |
| Response:                 | The Responsible Official is responsible for reviewing and approving the range of alternatives considered in the EIS. The public has had the opportunity to review and comment on the alternatives, and we have considered additional alternatives that have been suggested. See also the Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Study section in Chapter 2 of the EIS. |
| <b>PC 630</b>             | <b>The Forest should consider public comments.</b>   |
| Response:                 | We have considered public comments throughout the plan revision process. See Appendix A to the EIS, as well as the responses to comments on the DEIS and Proposed Revised Plan in this appendix.   |
| PC 630a                   | <b>INCLUDING THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF THE OUTSOURCED CONTENT ANALYSIS PROCESS</b>  |
| Response:                 | We do not believe that the content analysis process we used to organize comments on the Drafts had adverse effects on our ability to consider or respond to the comments.  |
| PC 630b                   | <b>INCLUDING COMMENTS OF PROPERTY OWNERS</b>   |
| Response:                 | We considered comments from any property owners that submitted them.   |
| PC 630c                   | <b>INCLUDING COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON THE 1986 FOREST PLAN</b>  |
| Response:                 | We did not consider comments on the 1986 Plan, but we believe the quotes that you cited from the Plan are as relevant today as they were 20 years ago, and they will still be relevant 20 years from now.  |
| PC 630d                   | <b>BECAUSE MOST AMERICANS ARE OPPOSED TO LOGGING IN NATIONAL FORESTS AND ROADLESS AREAS, AS SEEN IN NATIONAL POLLS</b>   |
| Response:                 | We do not believe that national polls, regardless of their content or purpose, constitute specific or substantive comments on our Proposed Revised Plan or DEIS, and we did not consider them as such.   |
| <b>PC 70</b>              | <b>The Forest should give more weight to majority opinion rather than minority opinion.</b>  |
| Response:                 | We are interested to hear what everyone has to say about our planning efforts, but we have also told people that Revised Plan or EIS changes will be more likely influenced by well-informed substantive comments on specific document elements or issues than they will by mass opinions or preferences.  |
| <b>PC 105</b>             | <b>The Forest should conduct more consultation with average citizens, including local people.</b>  |
| Response:                 | We have engaged the public openly throughout the revision process, including open houses, phone calls, e-mails, newsletters, and visits to local and county meetings. See Appendix A to the EIS.   |
| PC 105a                   | <b>INCLUDING CONDUCTING CITIZEN POLLS ABOUT WHAT THEY WOULD LIKE THE DIRECTION OF FOREST MANAGEMENT TO BE</b>  |
| Response:                 | We have heard from thousands of people, and we feel that the breadth of information and commentary we received was more valuable than any targeted poll we could have conducted. Although polls can be useful to gather specific information, they are typically limited by their design and are certainly no  |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
|               | substitute for open communication.  |
| <b>PC 397</b> | <b>The Forest should acknowledge that many respondents may feel that expressing their concerns is futile and will provide little incentive for the Forest Service to rethink its proposed plan.</b>   |
| Response:     | We appreciate the effort that you and others made to comment, and we assure you that your comments were read and considered, whether or not they generated a change in the Proposed Revised Plan.   |
| <b>PC 544</b> | <b>The Forest should work with appropriate state agencies to address forest management needs.</b>   |
| Response:     | We agree. See additional responses to this concern below.   |
| PC 544a       | INCLUDING CRITICAL WILDLIFE HABITAT NEEDS   |
| Response:     | The Forest has worked cooperatively with the WVDNR and the USFWS throughout the revision process to ensure that critical wildlife habitat needs are met.  |
| PC 544b       | INCLUDING WORKING WITH THE WEST VIRGINIA DIVISION OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN DEVELOPING THE SPRUCE RESTORATION PROGRAM   |
| Response:     | We intend to work cooperatively with WVDNR, USFWS, The Nature Conservancy, and other interested parties in implementing spruce restoration.   |
| PC 544c       | INCLUDING THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA IN THE PLANNING PROCESS BECAUSE THE STATE HAS NOT BENEFITED ECONOMICALLY FROM THE MONONGAHELA IN THE PAST  |
| Response:     | We believe that the State and local communities have benefited economically from the Forest. See the Social and Economic Environment section of the EIS for an analysis of effects that Forest activities and revenues have had, and may have on State counties and local communities.  |
| <b>PC 302</b> | <b>The Forest should consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</b>   |
| Response:     | We agree and we do.   |
| PC 302a       | BECAUSE THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT REQUIRES IT BEFORE INCREASING THE ACREAGE OF PRESCRIBED BURNS WITHIN THE FOREST  |
| Response:     | We have consulted informally and formally with the USFWS on the effects of the Revised Forest Plan on threatened and endangered species, including the effects of increased prescribed burning.   |
| PC 302b       | INCLUDING SPRUCE RESTORATION ACTIVITIES   |
| Response:     | Goal 4104 in the Proposed Revised Plan has been modified to include USFWS as a potential cooperater in designing and monitoring spruce restoration efforts.   |
| <b>PC 295</b> | <b>The Forest should work closely with partners.</b>  |
| Response:     | We work cooperatively with many agencies and organizations toward nature conservation and other objectives. More information on consultation, cooperation, and coordination can be found in the Introduction to Chapter II in the Proposed Revised Plan.  |
| PC 295a       | INCLUDING THE NATURE CONSERVANCY (TNC) TO ACCOMPLISH MONITORING AND EVALUATION  |
| Response:     | We believe there is good potential to work with TNC on monitoring or other projects.  |
| PC 295b       | INCLUDING THE WEST VIRGINIA WILDERNESS COALITION REGARDING LEGISLATION  |
| Response:     | We do not legislate, and neither does the West Virginia Wilderness Coalition.   |
| PC 295c       | INCLUDING CITIZEN GROUPS, BUSINESS TOURISM IN PARTICULAR GOVERNMENT TO PRESERVE IN BALANCE AS MUCH OF NATURE AS POSSIBLE  |
| Response:     | We have spoken with TNC about our intent to update the management plan for the NRA and how they could be involved.  |
| PC 295d       | INCLUDING THE WEST VIRGINIA DIVISION OF NATURAL RESOURCES (WVDNR) TO CLASSIFY ECOLOGICAL COMMUNITIES ON THE FOREST IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATIONAL VEGETATION CLASSIFICATION  |
| Response:     | We work with WVDNR in many capacities. The State had not completed its National Vegetation Classification efforts at the time we were revising the Forest Plan, and the Forest Service currently uses a different classification system. It may be possible to coordinate a workable crosswalk between our different systems in the future. |
| <b>PC 626</b> | <b>The Forest should consult agencies without bias.</b>   |
| Response:     | We agree. Information on consultation, cooperation, and coordination with other agencies can be found in the Introduction to Chapter II in the Proposed Revised Plan.   |
| <b>PC 633</b> | <b>The Forest should hold public hearings and provide for comments over an extended period.</b>   |
| Response:     | We considered your suggestion. Although public hearings can be cathartic for their participants, we did   |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
|               | not feel that they would provide any more information for plan revision beyond that received through direct public comment and interaction. Appendix A to the DEIS summarizes our public involvement, which includes a 90-day comment period on the DEIS and Proposed Revised Plan. We felt this period was more than adequate, and it produced nearly 13,000 comments for us to consider.  |
| <b>PC 610</b> | <b>The Forest should acknowledge that a strong majority of the public supports a high level of protection for wild areas in national forests.</b>   |
| Response:     | We acknowledge that we heard from many people who support protection and/or wilderness recommendation for many different areas on the Forest. These people are well represented in the public concerns and associated comments that we are addressing in this appendix. It was not always clear as to whether they considered the entire Forest “wild” or just the specific areas that they wanted to see recommended or designated as wilderness. Although the number of comments we received was impressive, it would be presumptuous of us to deduce that several thousand people represent “a strong majority of the public”, as stated in the comments. It may well be that these numbers more accurately represent the networking and recruiting skills of the environmental organizations that solicited them, based on the number of form letters and e-mails from letter generators we received. |
| <b>PC 209</b> | <b>The Forest should ask people on the mailing distribution list for assistance with soil, water, riparian, and aquatic active restoration projects.</b>  |
| Response:     | The Forest actively participates in partnerships with multiple entities to accomplish restoration and monitoring projects. The Forest does not solicit specific group or individual participation but does readily join partnerships and accept volunteers to aid in completing such projects. Successful partnerships have occurred with USDA- Natural Resource Conservation Service, universities, non-profit organizations such as Trout Unlimited, The Nature Conservancy, The Boy Scouts of America, individual volunteers, and other entities.  |
| <b>PC 331</b> | <b>The Forest should provide an objective admission of environmental impacts in their final response to comments, including your newsletter responses to complaints about rollbacks in protection or loss of protection for some existing 6.2 areas that are clearly attempts to cover up or deny the significance of these changes.</b>  |
| Response:     | We stand behind the objectivity of our EIS and the analyses of effects by alternative, including Alternative 4, which we consider a viable management option. The effects reported may have been “unacceptable” to the commenter, but that does not negate the fact that they were disclosed objectively.<br><br>As for the newsletter, we were in fact clarifying the overall disposition of backcountry recreation opportunities in Alternative 1 versus Alternative 2. We felt that this explanation was more objective and comprehensive than merely focusing on the disposition of existing 6.2 areas. The issue we are addressing in the EIS is backcountry recreation opportunities, of which 6.2 areas are only one component.  |

| <b>ADEQUACY AND AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION</b> |   |
|---|---|
| <b>PC 503</b>                                   | <b>The Forest should provide information about the sources of information it used when revising its Forest Plan, including consultation with non-governmental partners and interest groups, as well as federal, state, and county officials.</b>  |
| Response:                                       | The agencies, officials, organizations, interest groups, and individuals we have contacted or consulted are listed in Appendix A to the EIS. The information they provided is largely captured in the comment letters they sent us, or notes from meetings or other contacts we have had. These letters and notes are part of the project record.   |
| <b>PC 137</b>                                   | <b>The Forest should make the plan, proposals, and other relevant information easily accessible on the Internet to save paper.</b>  |
| Response:                                       | We have posted the Proposed Forest Plan, DEIS, Appendices to the DEIS, and several other plan-related documents on our internet site at: <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/mnf">www.fs.fed.us/r9/mnf</a> . The final documents are posted as well. Because there is limited space on the website, we have to make choices as to which documents would have more value or interest to the general public. Some are prohibitively large, and some are not currently available in electronic format. If there are specific documents you would like to see or copy, you may contact us at the Forest Supervisor’s Office, Monongahela National Forest, Elkins WV 26241. |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| PC 137a       | INCLUDING THE 1999 INTERIM GUIDES FOR ALTERNATIVE 1  |
| Response:     | We have not had any other requests for this document, so we have not posted it on the website. We can make a copy available to you if you contact us at the address above.   |
| PC 137b       | INCLUDING THE MONONGAHELA NATIONAL FOREST SCENERY MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS, DECEMBER 2004   |
| Response:     | This documentation is not available in electronic format.  |
| PC 137c       | INCLUDING THE AGRICULTURE HANDBOOK NUMBER 701  |
| Response:     | This handbook is not available to us in electronic format.   |
| PC 137d       | INCLUDING THE SOCIAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE MONONGAHELA NATIONAL FOREST  |
| Response:     | We document was too large to post on the website, and we have limited hard copies. We have made it available for people to come in and read or copy portions on request.   |
| <b>PC 723</b> | <b>The Forest should educate the public on various Forest subjects, including recreation, wilderness management, forest ecology, remote sensing and landscape analysis.</b>  |
| Response:     | We inform people about natural resource management in many different ways. The Seneca Rocks Discovery Center and Cranberry Nature Center are designed to provide information and education on a variety of forest topics. We have interpretive signs and programs, we speak at schools, we participate in outdoor environmental programs, and we distribute educational literature about forest resources, including wilderness, recreation, and ecology. We also try to make our various NEPA documents educational in terms of forest conditions and resources and how certain activities may affect them. |
| <b>PC 92</b>  | <b>The Forest should create reliable forest planning and project documents, including Biological Evaluations and Environmental Assessments.</b>  |
| Response:     | We believe we have created reliable planning documents for this revision, including the Biological Evaluation and Environmental Impact Statement.  |
| PC 92a        | INCLUDING SOLID EMPIRICAL DATA RATHER THAN COMPUTER SIMULATIONS  |
| Response:     | For the EIS analyses, we used a combination of empirical data, computer modeling, personal experience, and professional judgment.  |
| PC 92b        | INCLUDING PROPER CITATIONS OF RELIABLE, UP-TO-DATE SOURCES   |
| Response:     | We believe that we have used reliable and up-to-date sources to support the conclusions in the EIS. Recognize that our reference section includes more material than what was cited in the text, but we did review and consider all of the references cited.   |
| <b>PC 94</b>  | <b>The Forest should be straightforward in its documents, including no confusing euphemisms and no unanswered questions, to reduce FOIA requests.</b>  |
| Response:     | We believe we have been straightforward and we have provided information when requested. As of this writing, we have not had any revision-related requests under the Freedom of Information Act.   |
| <b>PC 287</b> | <b>The Forest should include additional information regarding the development of the forest plan.</b>  |
| Response:     | Besides the Forest Plan, EIS, Appendices, and map package, we have additional information in the project record to support the Forest Plan revision. We have made this information available to the public at various times, including posting some of the documents to our website. This information may be made available from the Forest Supervisors Office upon request.   |
| PC 287a       | INCLUDING WHAT SIGNIFICANT CHANGES HAD OCCURRED IN THE FOREST CONDITIONS AND DEMANDS THAT WARRANTED A REVISION OF THE FOREST PLAN  |
| Response:     | Need for Change related to plan revision is summarized in Appendix C to the Forest Plan, and more detailed information is presented in the Analysis of the Management Situation in the project record.   |
| PC 287b       | INCLUDING ADDITIONAL PROJECT-IMPLEMENTATION APPENDICES OR A SEPARATE "PROJECT PLANNING IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE" THAT IS SUPPORTED BY THE PROPOSED LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN   |
| Response:     | We are still considering a project implementation guide for various resources that could include many of the process or "how to" items that were in the 1986 Plan, and that could be adjusted as needed outside of the forest planning process. However, we still maintain that filling the Forest Plan with processes and procedures that may change over time is not a productive use of a strategic planning document, and can limit flexibility for effective planning and decision-making at the project level.   |
| PC 287c       | INCLUDING HOW THE FOREST PLANS TO MANAGE SUCCESS   |
| Response:     | Management success will be measured largely through the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan in Chapter  |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
|               | IV of the Forest Plan. Additional monitoring will likely occur at the project level. The new Planning Rule also has a strong emphasis on monitoring and accountability.  |
| PC 287d       | <b>INCLUDING WHETHER OR NOT THE ACTIONS TAKEN IN THE FOREST PLAN WILL MOVE THE FOREST TOWARD ITS 50-YEAR GOALS OR AWAY FROM THEM</b>   |
| Response:     | The Forest Plan does not implement any actions. However, the management goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines in the Plan are designed to move the Forest toward its desired conditions as described in Chapter II of the Plan.   |
| <b>PC 632</b> | <b>The Forest should make information widely available to the public because many people are unfamiliar with the Forest.</b>   |
| Response:     | We have made information available about the Forest in many different ways during plan revision, including open houses, meetings, newsletters, and posting informational documents on the internet.  |
| PC 632a       | <b>TO ENSURE THE PUBLIC'S OPINION IS HEARD</b>   |
| Response:     | This appendix is designed to provide a forum for public opinion and comment.   |
| PC 632b       | <b>INCLUDING PUBLIC FORUMS ON THE STATUS OF VARIOUS PROJECTS TO THE PUBLIC TO PROVIDE MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR VOLUNTEER WORK</b>  |
| Response:     | Although volunteer work is beyond the scope of plan revision, the Forest is interested in hearing from people who would like to volunteer.   |
| <b>PC 439</b> | <b>The Forest should provide the specific results of the scoping process in the DEIS, including an accurate representation of public support for wilderness and backcountry recreation, because the DEIS's discussion of the public's support of non-logging management is misleading.</b>   |
| Response:     | The discussion on page 3-363 of the DEIS regarding Need For Change was merely intended to show that Backcountry Recreation was one of the major topics of interest in plan revision, and that we heard different opinions as to the amount of opportunity the Forest should provide. We were not trying "to mislead the public that wilderness is bad", as you have interpreted in your comments. You are correct that the majority of the 705 scoping comments were in favor of the Forest providing more wilderness and other backcountry recreation opportunities. However, we also received over 1,100 letters from the West Virginia Forestry Association prior to the release of the DEIS that were clearly in favor of no additional wilderness on the Forest. We did not mention this on page 3-363, either, because we were more interested in representing the diversity than the demographics of opinion. |
| <b>PC 240</b> | <b>The Forest should explain where its analysis of long-term needs is located.</b>   |
| Response:     | The "long-term needs" that are cited on page 3-418 of the DEIS refer specifically to the Chapter II Forest Plan direction for roads on pages II-50 through II-52. For example, Goal FR02 says to, "Provide developed roads to the density and maintenance level needed to meet resource and use objectives." Guideline RF08 says to, "Evaluate transportation needs based on existing uses and condition, environmental and economic impacts, and compatibility with management prescriptions." The Forest Plan is a strategic document and therefore does not attempt to define the long-term needs of each road on the Forest, or how each road would help achieve the needs of other resources. These decisions can only be made appropriately at the project planning level.   |
| <b>PC 231</b> | <b>The Forest should explain how they will carry out the Forest Plan with a limited budget because there seems to be an assumption that the Plan is based on unlimited funding, and there is a danger that objectives that require money and personnel, such as timber sales, might not receive adequate attention.</b>  |
| Response:     | The Forest's budgeting process is described on page I-12 of the Proposed Revised Plan. We cannot assume that we will have a limited budget in Forest Plan revision, nor can we pretend we will have an unlimited budget. Instead we have focused on providing reasonable desired conditions, goals, and objectives, which will be used in preparing annual implementation budgets. It is up to Congress to appropriate funding, which may vary from year to year depending on a number of factors. We will pursue achievement of our goals, objectives and desired conditions as aggressively as we can based on the funding we receive.   |
| <b>PC 618</b> | <b>The Forest should disclose the exact budget and staffing levels, as well as the percentage change from current budgets (by resource area) and staffing levels necessary to achieve the various alternatives, because the budget would have to increase dramatically to achieve the timber volumes and revenues predicted.</b>   |
| Response:     | Exact breakdowns of budget and staffing levels are more appropriately stored in the project record and   |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
|               | model inputs. They are available upon request.   |
| PC 618a       | INCLUDING A DISCUSSION OF THE BUDGET TO REACH THE ALLOWABLE SALE QUANTITY IN THE FOREST PLAN   |
| Response:     | We have added a brief discussion of budget and staffing levels to the economic analysis in the Final EIS in response to these comments.  |
| PC 618b       | INCLUDING A DISCUSSION OF WHETHER LEASING FOREST LANDS FOR COMMERCIAL TIMBER HARVEST AT BELOW MARKED PRICES DEGRADES THE VALUE OF PRIVATE TIMBER LANDS   |
| Response:     | Although timber pricing is beyond the scope of this plan revision, we felt that it should be clarified that the Forest does not lease lands to timber companies. We appraise timber in our sales at fair market value, and company bids often exceed the appraised value.  |
| <b>PC 234</b> | <b>The Forest should use correct, up-to-date budget data.</b>  |
| Response:     | We have updated budget data for the FEIS.  |
| PC 234a       | BECAUSE IF THE BUDGET DATA PROVIDED IS CORRECT, WILDERNESS AREAS COULD BE MAXIMIZED WITH NO JUMP IN COSTS OR STAFF TO MANAGE THESE AREAS   |
| Response:     | We agree that recommended wilderness areas would likely be managed with no significant jump in costs or staff under Alternatives 2 or 3. If all areas were to be designated as Wilderness by Congress, additional costs and staffing may be needed over time, particularly under Alternative 3. However, we do not have the authority to designate Wilderness, and we cannot assume that Wilderness would be designated by Congress in our current budget estimates. |
| PC 234b       | BECAUSE AS FEDERAL APPROPRIATION LEVELS STAY FLAT OR DROP, IT IS MORE LIKELY THAT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN NON-TIMBER RESOURCE AREAS CAN STILL BE MET   |
| Response:     | We do not necessarily agree with your assumption. Specific resource allocations within the budget can vary greatly, regardless of whether the overall budget stays flat or drops.  |
| PC 234c       | BECAUSE IF THE BUDGET DATA IS INCORRECT, THE EXPERIENCES OF VISITORS WILL BE NEGATIVELY AFFECTED   |
| Response:     | Different levels of staff and budget may or may not have effects on visitor experiences, depending on a number of factors, but they are less likely to affect the dispersed recreation experiences that you mention than developed recreation experiences.   |
| <b>PC 579</b> | <b>The Forest should provide discussion of the Net Public Benefits used for selection of the preferred alternative</b>   |
| Response:     | The rationale for the selected alternative, including its net public benefits, is provided in the Record of Decision and at the end of Chapter 2 in the FEIS.  |
| <b>PC 230</b> | <b>The Forest should provide discussion of the harmful effects of development on private and National Forest System lands, because the Forest Service seems to be unprepared to deal with the flood of people moving to the Forest area from urban areas.</b>  |
| Response:     | The effects of private and management-related development are discussed throughout Chapter 3 of the EIS. We have not yet seen a flood of people moving to the Forest from urban areas, although additional private development within the Forest proclamation boundary is always possible on private lands.  |

| <b>LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS</b> |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>PC 634</b>               | <b>The Forest should have complied with laws and regulations related to information quality in the analysis.</b>  |
| Response:                   | We believe we have complied with the National Environmental Policy Act with regard to the quality of information in the analysis, as represented in the Draft and Final EIS, and the project record.  |
| <b>PC 464</b>               | <b>The Forest should comply with National Forest Management Act regarding suitability.</b>  |
| Response:                   | The National Forest Management Act in 36 CFR 219 defines suitability as, "The appropriateness of applying certain resource management practices to a particular area of land, as determined by an analysis of the economic and environmental consequences...A unit of land may be suitable for a variety of individual or combined management practices." We have complied with this definition by assigning lands on the Forest to various Management Prescriptions. Each Management Prescription has specific |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
|               | goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines, with defined management practices to achieve the desired conditions for multiple resource uses. See pages 3-335 through 3-337 in the DEIS for timber suitability determination.  |
| PC 464a       | INCLUDING UTILIZING THOROUGH, SOUND ANALYSES TO ENSURE THAT ALL AREAS THAT ARE PHYSICALLY UNSUITABLE FOR LOGGING (DUE TO SOIL, WATER, RESTOCKING, OR OTHER CONCERNS) ARE PROPERLY IDENTIFIED IN PLAN REVISION  |
| Response:     | Physical unsuitability is ultimately determined at the project level with site-specific information, rather than at the Forest-wide level with broad-scale information. Areas that are physically unsuited for timber production have been identified in the past through on-the-ground verification, and they have been carried forward as unsuited in Forest Plan revision. See Table TR-9 in the Timber Supply section of Chapter 3 in the FEIS that identifies lands that are not considered tentatively suited for commercial timber harvest. The Forest will continue to identify such lands at the project level as appropriate.  |
| PC 464b       | INCLUDING UTILIZING THOROUGH, SOUND ANALYSES TO ENSURE THAT ALL AREAS THAT ARE ECONOMICALLY UNSUITABLE FOR LOGGING (DUE TO TRANSPORTATION, LOGGING, ADMINISTRATION OR OTHER COSTS) ARE PROPERLY IDENTIFIED IN PLAN REVISION  |
| Response:     | The Forest has completed an analysis of “economic and environmental consequences...” as described in 36 CFR 19. The economic portion of the analysis involves “cost efficiency” as defined in CFR 219.3: “The usefulness of specified inputs (costs) to produce specified outputs (benefits). In measuring cost efficiency, some outputs, including environmental, economic, or social impacts, are not assigned monetary values but are achieved at specified levels in the least cost manner. Cost efficiency is usually measured using present net value...” The Forest conducted a present net value analysis in the DEIS (page 3-456), and has updated this analysis for the FEIS. This analysis used specified costs and benefits to compare how the alternatives achieved desired conditions in the least cost manner.                |
| PC 464c       | INCLUDING EXAMINING WHAT INVESTMENTS ARE REQUIRED FOR TIMBER PRODUCTION, INCLUDING PRE-COMMERCIAL THINNING, BRUSH CONTROL; INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL, MITIGATION, ROAD MAINTENANCE, TREE PLANTING, ETC.   |
| Response:     | The investments needed for timber production are listed in the Economic Information Collection section of Appendix B to the EIS. They include sale preparation and administration, NEPA documentation, fencing, planting, site preparation (including invasive species control), stocking surveys, tree planting, vine control, and post-harvest tree release and non-commercial thinning. The investments do not include road maintenance, as sale road maintenance is generally conducted by the purchaser during the sale, and is addressed as a penalty to revenue that would otherwise be received by the Forest rather than a direct cost. These are typically Maintenance Level 1 or 2 roads that are closed to the public after the sale and that receive little or no maintenance until such time they are needed for another sale. |
| PC 464d       | INCLUDING EXAMINING ALL PERTINENT FACTORS WHEN DETERMINING SUITABILITY, INCLUDING THAT OF PRECLUDING ALTERNATIVE USES OF LAND  |
| Response      | We examined the pertinent factors described above; as well what alternative uses of land may be precluded. The range of alternative uses is described in Chapter 2 of the EIS, in the “Development of the Reasonable Range of Alternatives” and the “Alternatives Considered in Detail” sections. The alternatives considered in detail and the alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed study describe a wide range of alternative uses that may occur or be precluded.   |
| <b>PC 270</b> | <b>The Forest should subject any project involving significant environmental impacts to the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process.</b>  |
| Response:     | We agree. We have stated as much on page II-1 of the Proposed Revised Plan. This process is also required by the NEPA for any major federal actions implemented on the Forest.   |
| <b>PC 160</b> | <b>The Forest should not allow the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act to override the Organic Act and the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act.</b>  |
| Response:     | As stated on page II-1 of the Proposed Revised Plan, we must follow all applicable federal laws, including those you have noted.   |
| <b>PC 93</b>  | <b>The Forest should adhere to the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act to serve as a large demonstration area for a wide variety of uses.</b>   |
| Response:     | We adhere to the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act, and we agree that we manage a large demonstration area for a wide variety of uses.  |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| PC 93a        | <b>INCLUDING CONDUCTING AN ADEQUATE RELATIVE VALUE ANALYSIS</b>  |
| Response:     | The entire Environmental Impact Statement can be regarded as a “relative value analysis”, as it describes various uses and resources on the Forest, and how they interact with each other. We have also analyzed the relative values of certain uses and resources in the Social and Economic Environment section of Chapter 3 in the EIS. These relative values have also been considered and disclosed in the Record of Decision.  |
| PC 93b        | <b>BECAUSE A RELATIVE VALUE ANALYSIS WOULD SHOW THAT THE FOREST IS MORE VALUABLE LEFT AS A NATURAL FOREST TO PROVIDE HABITAT, RECREATION, SCENERY, WATERSHED PROTECTION, CARBON STORAGE, AND CLEAN AIR</b>   |
| Response:     | All of the alternatives analyzed in detail would provide a variety of habitats, scenery, and recreation opportunities, just as they all would contribute to watershed protection, carbon storage, and clean air. We recognize there may be ecosystem service values associated with the amenities described above. Dollar values placed on these services may be obtained from a wide variety of sources, with widely varying results. Obtaining these values is generally very expensive and time consuming. In most cases, values of these services would not vary measurably between the alternatives presented in the EIS. If there is no significant difference, then there is not sufficient reason to expend tax-payers resources to estimate the values. That is not to say they will not be provided or protected under the Plan, and qualitatively valued in our decision process. The Responsible Official selects the alternative that he feels represents the best mix of uses, activities, and resource management, based on many factors, including the analysis of effects on relative resource values presented in the EIS. The rationale for this decision is included in the Record of Decision for this plan revision.   |
| PC 93c        | <b>BECAUSE THE FIRST PRIORITY OF THE FOREST SHOULD BE PROTECTING THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES</b>   |
| Response:     | The Revised Forest Plan contains ample direction to protect threatened and endangered species. The Forest Service Manual directs the Forest Service to place top priority on conservation and recovery of endangered, threatened, and proposed species and their habitats (FSM 2670.31). However, the Forest is subject to many different laws and regulations, and does not have the authority to prioritize one federal law above another.   |
| <b>PC 625</b> | <b>The Forest should consider Executive Orders 11988, 11990, 12898, and 13112.</b>   |
| Response:     | We have considered these Executive Orders and we are legally required to meet their intent. Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 direct federal agencies to avoid, where possible, impacts associated with the destruction or modification of floodplains and wetlands. As stated on page 3-465 of the DEIS, “Revised Forest-wide management direction provides a broad spectrum of standards and guidelines designed to protect soil, water, riparian, and aquatic resources. The goals and intent of Executive Orders 11988 (Floodplain Management) and 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) would be met through compliance with this direction.”<br><br>Executive Order 12898 directs federal agencies to address equity and fairness to minorities and low income communities in resource decision making. As stated on page 3-450 of the DEIS, we found no indication that any of the alternatives would adversely or disproportionately affect racial minorities or low income communities.<br><br>Executive Order 13112 addresses non-native invasive species. The 1986 Forest Plan is essentially silent on this subject. For the Proposed Revised Plan we included Forest-wide management direction to address non-native invasive species (see page II-18), including a goal to develop a Forest Non-native Invasive Species Management Plan in coordination with county state, and federal agencies. |
| <b>PC 143</b> | <b>The Forest should implement ISO 14001 to make forest planning more efficient.</b>   |
| Response:     | The ISO 14001 concept has been incorporated into the 2005 Planning Rule. This Forest Plan revision was completed under the 1982 planning regulations, and therefore the 2005 Planning Rule and its directives did not apply. However, the Forest Plan will be transitioning to assimilate the new Planning Rule directives over the next few years, so the Forest will be adopting the Environmental Management System (EMS) form of ISO 14001 in the near future.   |
| <b>PC 679</b> | <b>The Forest should explain how it intends to comply with the Clean Water Act.</b>  |
| Response:     | The Forest is obligated to comply with all laws. Actions specific to protecting clean water on the Forest include providing areas on the Forest where land management activities and potential disturbances are  |

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
|           | minimized (e.g. wilderness, recommended wilderness, roadless areas, MP 6.2), development of standards and guidelines that protect soil, water, riparian and aquatic ecosystems when implementing forest management activities, implementation of projects designed to restore watershed conditions, and cooperation with other agencies, organizations and individuals to address soil, water and air related issues that affect water quality on the Forest.  |
| PC 679a   | <b>INCLUDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LIST OF IMPAIRED WATER BODIES</b>  |
| Response: | The West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP) is the lead agency responsible for developing the list of impaired water bodies, known as the 303(d) list.  |
| PC 679b   | <b>BECAUSE THE FOREST ADMITS THAT IT IS UNCLEAR HOW MANY STREAMS HAVE BEEN SAMPLED WITHIN THE FOREST PROCLAMATION BOUNDARY AND WHAT PERCENTAGES ARE CONSIDERED IMPAIRED</b>  |
| Response: | Information related to aquatic resources is often limited. Currently, the WVDEP recognizes five stream categories through the water quality assessment process. Category 3 streams are streams that have insufficient or no information to determine if the designated uses are being met. This category includes 43.3% of the streams in the state and is the largest of the five categories (WVDEP 2004). These streams are typically the smaller, headwater tributaries to larger systems that have been assessed and they contribute positively or negatively to the assessment of the larger system. When a stream is not on the 303(d) list, we do not want to assume it is because it is in compliance when it could be due to a lack of information. In the absence of complete information, compliance with the Clean Water Act is achieved through implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize non-point source pollution. These are applied to all streams within the project areas regardless of their designation. The intent is to recognize the importance of the drainage network and not just those streams that are considered impaired. Even streams that legally meet their water quality standards often do not meet their productive potential due to water quality or habitat related issues.  |
| PC 679c   | <b>INCLUDING HOW THE FOREST WILL COMPLY WITH TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD (TMDL) REQUIREMENTS</b>  |
| Response: | The EPA and the WVDEP are the lead agencies in the development of TMDLs. The Forest would be considered a stakeholder and could participate in the development of TMDLs for streams on NFS lands. In general, effects associated with forest management activities are non-point sources of pollution which are addressed through the implementation of BMPs and Forest Plan standards and guidelines. Direction to protect soil and water resources can be found in the Proposed Forest Plan (pages II-8 to II-13) with additional direction located in the Wildlife and Fish section (pages II-25 to II-27). Opportunities to improve streams on the 303(d) list are identified at the watershed assessment and project planning level.  |
| PC 840    | <b>The Forest should explain whether some cutting and yarding methods and prescriptions, including many clearcutting variants are consistent with NFMA and should be permitted because they are highly visible and the Forest's visual resources should be protected.</b>  |
| Response: | The 1976 National Forest Management Act and its implementing regulations allow for clearcutting and other even-aged timber harvest silvicultural systems and harvest or yarding methods. In 1992, however, the Chief of the Forest Service issued a policy letter that stated that clearcutting should only be used when it is the optimal method of achieving management objectives, with a number of exceptions. This is the Forest's policy as well. We typically use other even-aged harvest systems—like shelterwoods, two-aged, and commercial thinning—far more often than clearcutting. Clearcutting with reserve trees is only used by the Forest when an interdisciplinary team of specialists determines, through site-specific analysis, that this is the optimum method for achieving objectives or meets one of the exceptions in the Chief's letter.<br><br>We agree that the Forest's visual resources should be protected, and we have a Scenic Management System in place to guide us in that protection. In many parts of the Forest, clearcutting with reserve trees would not meet the scenic integrity objectives for areas of high concern. Where it is considered acceptable, the visual effects of clearcutting with reserve trees would generally be short term, as trees regenerate and grow quickly in this part of the country. Measures can also be applied to mitigate visual effects, such as placement of harvest units, use of vegetative or terrain buffers, or modification of silvicultural prescriptions. See also responses to PC 637 and PC 163. |
| PC 635    | <b>The Forest should use the best available science to comply with NEPA, because the forest plan fails to use much of the published wildlife and forestry research.</b>  |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| Response:     | We believe that we have used the best available science that is appropriate for this area and this proposal. The EIS includes appropriate references to scientific literature to support the analyses. We have also considered additional science that people have sent us during the revision process, not all of which was appropriate.  |
| <b>PC 841</b> | <b>The Forest should rewrite its revised plan to address the following:</b>  |
| PC 841a       | CHANGED CONDITIONS (GLOBAL WARMING AND STORMS, WORSENING HYDROLOGICAL CONDITIONS AND YOUR GOAL OF RECOVERY, ROADS AND IMPERVIOUS SERVICES AND THE NEED TO COMPENSATE WATERSHED BY WATERSHED FOR USE ON PRIVATE LAND, AND REDUCED EVAPOTRANSPIRATION BY A SLOWER GROWING FOREST.)   |
| Response:     | The Revised Plan does not address changed conditions through assessment of conditions. That assessment can be found in the Analysis of the Management Situation and the EIS that support the Plan. The Revised Plan does have direction that addresses hydrological elements and roads. See also the response to PC 392 on global warming.   |
| PC 841b       | NEW SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION (LIMIT IMPOSED ON HARVEST ON INFERTILE GEOLOGIES; AND THE HYDROLOGICAL DAMAGE FROM CLEARCUTTING AND ROADS).   |
| Response:     | We have reviewed the scientific information that you submitted on “infertile geologies”, clearcutting and roads, but we did not find anything that would cause us to rewrite the Revised Plan.   |
| PC 841c       | DIRECTION OF NEW AND OLD LAWS, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES, (THE DOMBECK PLAN DIRECTIVES).  |
| Response:     | Chapter I of the Revised Forest Plan and the Record of Decision summarize how the Plan relates to pertinent laws, regulations, and policies. We are not sure what is meant by “the Dombeck Directives, as there are no directives by this name in the Forest Service Manual or Handbook. The former Chief Dombeck had four priorities during his tenure, but these have since been superceded by the current Chief’s priorities. |