

Granite Goose Draft EA Letter

Tabulation of Voter Ballots

Feb 1, 2024 12:00 PM

1/28/2024 13:53:22	Garret Visser	Idaho Wildlife Federation	Yes, can live with it
1/28/2024 15:45:20	Gloria Pippin	Heartland Back Country Horsemen	No, can't live with it (next question required)
1/29/2024 7:27:25	Wendy Green	Adams Soil & Water Conservatio n District	Yes, can live with it
1/29/2024 8:28:38	Randy Fox	Idaho Conservatio n League	Yes, can live with it
1/29/2024 9:39:24	Mike Reggear	Idaho Forest Group	No, can't live with it (next question required)
1/29/2024 9:49:03	John Lewinski	Citizen	Yes, can live with it
1/29/2024 17:46:58	Michael Gibson	Trout Unlimited	Yes, can live with it
1/30/2024 11:15:14	Larry Laxson	Valley County	No, can't live with it (next question required)
1/30/2024 16:25:17	Viki Purdy	Adams County	No, can't live with it (next question required)
1/31/2024 8:08:52	Jim Wasmuth	Tamarack Mills LLC	Enthusiastically support
2/1/2024 6:52:37	Frank Schwartz	Weiser River Cattle Association	No, can't live with it (next question required)

Comments from Members Who Oppose Submitting the Letter

If you can't live with the comment letter, what changes are required to the letter in order to gain your support?

1. Gloria Plppin

The PNF needs to address the bike park issue, which was obviously approved without PFC knowing about it. Are they going to fence in the bike park and restrict fast riding to the bike park; or will they wait until someone on a horse or a bike gets badly injured because of inappropriate behaviors? We don't care if there is a bike park, as long as it is fenced and delineated as the only place where bikers ride fast. The bridges in the bike park are too narrow for equestrians, so they are not even to FS standards.

2. Mike Reggear

Additional evaluation or scoping of the impacts of the Old Growth policy on the Granite Goose project. To what degree will it reduce or eliminate projected vegetation management projects.

3. Larry Laxson

30 day comment period is unacceptably short for organizations to share and vote. In the last meeting I asked for the documentation on the analysis for closing land to historical users and it was never received. I would hope that by not supporting the project the forest leadership might take notice and listen to ALL the voices of the collaborative.

4. Viki Purdy

I will not be supporting the PFC Steering Committee letter though I really appreciate the amount of work that went into it. I will also not be supporting the Granite Goose EA.

My reasons for not supporting either document are based on the input of people that are very concerned about the Forest Service continuing to release volumes of information and making no effort to engage and benefit from public involvement. This EA is far from easy to understand and immediately causes confusion and mistrust.

As a member of the PFC, I am concerned that the Forest Service would state that this huge EA document is "implementing the current Forest Plan" and not changing the plan under the radar screen and resulting in a revision. The people that depend on a relationship with the PNF for their recreation and for their livelihoods do not have any confidence that the existing Forest Plan is being implemented. This is becoming the majority assumption when land allocations in the Forest Plan are changed through this kind of confusing process.

Another reason I cannot support the PFC letter or the EA, is because there is no on the ground data shared or considered in this EA to support the need for the changes and the new management actions. For instance, I have been asked:

- how closing Granite Mountain is justified;
- how *wildland* fire (not *prescribed* fire) is now going to be allowed to burn in roadless areas just as in designated Wilderness Areas;
- why timber harvest is now not allowed in these same areas when it is in the Forest Plan; and,
- where the analysis of why wildland fires will be allowed to burn in roadless areas is not justified with data while mature trees are not going to be harvested per the existing Forest Plan.

I appreciate being a member of the PFC because my role allows me to know first-hand why people are so concerned about why the Forest Service is no longer having public meetings. I am disappointed that our PFC meeting earlier this month regarding this EA was only via Zoom and not open to the public.

Many people have friends and relatives that work on the PNF that do not know why the support of USFS plans has become very low. This is a symptom of how the USFS is not involving their own employees and the public in Forest Plan implementation. This creates the lowest public knowledge and involvement in our history as a coalition.

I do not think a 200- page EA could have been completed since the PFC November 18, 2023, meeting or during the holidays by our PNF staff. I think that the USFS should be transparent with the PFC and that this issue can be resolved soon.

In closing, I also cannot understand why the PFC was not informed about the Old Growth inventories taken on the PNF last year that led to the December 20, 2023, Federal Register Notice for a single EIS for 128 Forest Plan Amendments for Old Growth on all national forests. This seems to present a problem for the PNF in having to re-do the EA with this new information.

Respectfully submitted,

Viki Purdy

5. Frank Schwartz

Reasons contained in WRCA comment letter. Letter includes recommendations to resolve comments raised.