IV.14 Responses to Individual RDEIR E-Mail Comments EC-1 to EC-184

This section presents responses to individual public comments (i.e., not form letter or form letter based) received via e-mail. The responses immediately follow each letter and are organized in the same order as the comments in each letter. Several of the letters included attachments. Attachments were not included herein if our response did not directly reference the attachment.

E-mail submissions with multiple copies of a single letter format will be addressed in one sample from each type of form letter. Those with additional comments added will be addressed individually if the comment is substantive and thus warrants a separate response.

There will not be comment letters for every number within the series because some letters dropped if they were duplicates or if they were found to be form letters. Form letters are responded to in their own section of the FEIR.

EC-1

Gipson, Lisa

From:	Rob Ellingson [rpe3@eoni.com]
Posted At:	Monday, July 16, 2007 11:33 AM
Conversation:	Alternative G -Supplemental EIR for Jackson Demonstration State Forest
Posted To:	Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment
Subject:	Alternative G -Supplemental EIR for Jackson Demonstration State Forest

1 I have reviewed Alternative G for the Jackson State Forest and feel that it is the right direction for the future. Your staff members have obviously spent a great deal of time formulating this plan and should be congratulated for their work.

Robert Ellingson

Email Letter EC-1

Response to Comment 1
Support for Alternative G noted.

California Forestry Association
1215 K Street, Suite 1830
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 444-6592 fax (916) 444-0170
www.foresthealth.org cfa@foresthealth.org

EC-2

July 16, 2007

California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
P.O., Box 944246
Sacramento, California 94244-2460
JDSFPublicComment@fire.ca.gov

Re: Jackson Demonstration State Forest Recirculated Draft EIR and Mgmt Plan for Alternative G

1 The California Forestry Association ("CFA") submits the following comments regarding the *Jackson Demonstration State Forest Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report and Draft Management Plan for Alternative G* (DEIR and/or Draft Plan). CFA is a non-profit trade association representing forest landowners, professional resource managers, and producers of wood products and biomass energy throughout California. They manage their lands, not only to provide a sustainable timber supply for the manufacture of wood products that Californians and citizens throughout the world rely on, but also to ensure that the public trust resources on those lands are adequately protected for future generations.

2 Many of our members are dependent, in part, on timber sales offered on the Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF) to help sustain their lumber milling operations along the North Coast. Other members derive a portion of their revenues as licensed timber operators who are responsible for conducting harvesting operations on the JDSF. Moreover, all forest landowners and professional forest resource managers benefit from the research and technical information derived from the demonstration projects conducted on the JDSF.

3 After reviewing the Draft Plan, we conclude that the level of harvest proposed in Alternative G is too far below the expected growth of the forest. CFA therefore supports a management plan with annual timber harvest set close to growth and includes protection of listed species and recruitment of recovery habitat for listed species as opportunities arise. CFA recommends combining the harvest rate elements of Alternative B with the research-driven elements of Alternative G.

BACKGROUND

4 JDSF provides an opportunity to demonstrate sustainable forest management techniques on nearly 50,000 acres of forest and watershed lands, as well as the opportunity to explore the potential for long-term sustained yield at the forest level, offering the public and private sectors an opportunity to view the potential level and balance of production and protection that can be realized from a large forested ownership when provided with the proper incentive.

5 The management of the JDSF has been an area of controversy for many years. The California Legislature ("Legislature") established the state forest system for the specific purpose of retaining the forest land "**in timber production** for research and demonstration purposes" and charged the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection ("CDF") as the manager of that system, "**to achieve maximum sustained production of high-quality forest products** while giving consideration to values relating to recreation, watershed, wildlife, range and forage, fisheries and aesthetic enjoyment."[1]

[1] PRC §§ 4631, 4631.5, 4639 and 4645.

5 Demonstration forests play an important role in testing the efficacy of forest management techniques, and it is the policy of the state to acquire areas for the purpose of demonstration of economic forest management.[2] California's Public Resources Code ("PRC") defines "management" to mean "the handling of forest crop and forest soil so as **to achieve maximum sustained production of high-quality forest products** while giving consideration to values relating to recreation, watershed, wildlife, range and forage, fisheries, and aesthetic enjoyment."[3]

In addition to the statutory mandate for demonstration forests, Board Policy 0351.2 states, in part, "[t]imber production **will be the primary use** on the Jackson State Forest . . ." and "[r]ecreation is recognized as a secondary but compatible land use . ." Board Policy 0351.4 also directs CDF to conduct regular periodic timber sales on the JDSF.

DISCUSSION

6 It is clear from the enabling legislation, Board policies, and timber harvesting regulations that the principal purposes of JDSF is the demonstration of sustainable and economic timber production, through regular periodic timber sales, in consideration of other forest values and in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations. The essential theme of **"maximum sustained production of high-quality forest products"**[4] is the primary driver of management at JDSF. This can be accomplished without eliminating recreation, fisheries, aesthetics, and other non-timber related values, which while important, are not the mandated priority of JDSF.

7 Unfortunately, CDF has drafted an update to the current JDSF Management Plan that elevates wildlife, watersheds, and ecosystem processes to a level of importance superior to timber production. Given the legal mandates discussed above, this is an improper prioritization of uses for JDSF.

Therefore, CFA strongly encourages CDF to adhere to statutory mandates by managing JDSF for research in various natural sciences of the forested landscape; demonstration of existing and new methods of sustainable timberland management; educational efforts, tours, publications and demonstrations; maintenance and enhancement of wildlife and fisheries habitats; and public recreations **in their proper order of priority**.

Despite recommendations by those who would prefer to see the purpose of JDSF changed to focus primarily, or even solely, on habitat or recreation, such a decision would be inconsistent with the mandate to demonstrate sustainable timber management as called for in the enabling legislation. In order to remain consistent with this mandate, the Management Plan must be developed in that manner. Therefore, the newly proposed Alternative G should be modified to incorporate elements of Alternative B that will substantially increase timber harvest levels including the ability to utilize the clear cut method beyond the arbitrary cap proposed in Alternative G. This will more fully facilitate the research and demonstration value of the forest for varying sizes of forest entities.

8 For the reasons set forth above, CFA strongly encourages the Board to revisit Alternative B which includes an annual timber harvest set close to growth per year and conservation practices that meet or exceed the requirements of the Forest Practice Rules. This alternative includes protection of listed species and recruitment of recovery habitat for listed species, includes a demonstration program, and the maintenance of existing recreational facilities while adhering to the legislative intent and mandate found in statute for JDSF. A vibrant forest industry needs a regional view and perspective, similar to what current forestland owners and managers encounter. Alternative B most

[2] PRC § 4631.
[3] PRC § 4639.
[4] PRC § 4651.

8 closely provides that perspective. JDSF was not intended to be a "cash cow," however, it is perfectly appropriate to harvest under the Forest Practice Rules in order to fund research and development, management and forest improvement projects. Alternative B will provide more funding than the other alternatives and therefore, more research will be available to demonstrate that balance is possible.

CONCLUSION

9 CFA strongly encourages the Board to combine Alternative G, with its strong emphasis on research, with the timber harvest levels in Alternative B. In so doing, you will meet the clear legislative directive for "maximum sustained production of high-quality forest products" and your own policy that requires that "timber production will be the primary use on the Jackson State Forest . . ."

Sincerely,

Michele Dias

Michele Dias
Vice President for Environmental and Legal Affairs

3

Email Letter EC-2

Response to Comments 1-2
Comments noted.

Response to Comment 3
Comment noted. The Board's proposed Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan is based on minor modifications to Alternative G, which was circulated as a part of the 2007 Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR). The proposed Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan establishes that, given the various management constraints and goals of the Plan, the annual average harvest is expected to be in the range of 20-25 MMBF per year and may not exceed 35 MMBF. The harvest ceiling established in the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan, although not likely to be achieved, is close to the average annual harvest level estimated for Alternative B.

Response to Comment 4
The Board recognizes the importance of the research and demonstration role of Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF). The Board and the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) have both expressed an interest in JDSF being the flagship of a world-class research and demonstration forest system. The top goal detailed in the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan is Research and Demonstration (see Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan, Chapter 1):

> **Goal #1 - RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION:** Improve the amount and quality of information concerning economic forest and timber management, forest ecosystem processes, watershed processes, performance of forest protection measures, that is available to the general public, forest landowners, resource professionals, timber operators, the timber industry, and researchers.

Response to Comment 5
The potential role for JDSF in testing the efficacy of forest management techniques is specifically addressed in the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan, including the designation of three areas for testing approaches to riparian restoration demonstration (see Map Figure 5).

The statutes and Board policies for the management of the Demonstration State Forests and JDSF in particular are discussed and reproduced in the 2005 DEIR (see, e.g., Section II and Appendix 5). The Board carefully reviewed these mandates in its consideration of management direction for JDSF and finds that the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan is consistent with them.

It should be noted that Board Policies 0351.2 and 0351.3 both stress that the primary purpose of the Demonstration State Forests is to conduct innovative demonstrations, experiments, and education in forest management (see response to Comment 4 above, Goal #1).

Goals #2-4 more specifically describe how a balance is to be achieved among (#2) Forest Restoration, (#3) Watershed and Ecosystem Processes, and (#4) Timber Management. Recreation, which is addressed under Goal #5, clearly plays a secondary role to other forest management objectives. Maximum sustained production of high quality timber production is addressed under the response to Comment 7.

Response to Comment 6
See response to Comments 5 and 7.

Response to Comment 7
See response to Comment 5. Public Resources Code (PRC) § 4639 defines "management" of JDSF as:

> ... the handling of forest crop and forest soil so as to achieve maximum sustained production of high quality forest products while giving consideration to values relating to recreation, watershed, wildlife, range and forage, fisheries, and aesthetic enjoyment.

The Board has substantial discretion in determining the consideration to be given to the listed nontimber values while implementing the direction for maximum sustained production of high quality forest products.

The statutes and Board policies for the management of the Demonstration State Forests and JDSF in particular are discussed and reproduced in the 2005 DEIR (see, e.g., section II and Appendix 5). The Board carefully reviewed these mandates in its consideration of management direction for JDSF and finds that the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan is consistent with them. See also the response to Comment 5.

Response to Comment 8
While the Board has not chosen the specific management direction of Alternative B, the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan approved by the Board provides the various elements described in the comment. While the Board anticipates that the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan will result in a lower level of harvest than would Alternative B [an expected 20-25 million board feet (MMBF) per year for the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan, but in no case greater than 35MMBF/year, as compared to 35.6 MMBF/year for Alternative B], the Board notes that this level of harvest will provide substantial revenues for management of JDSF, including research and demonstration.

Response to Comment 9
Comment noted. Please also see response to Comments 5 and 7.

EC-4

pson. Lisa

From: mgood@citlink.net
Posted At: Thursday, June 21, 2007 9:10 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly support giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

I can support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar harvest needs to
2 have a research justification and have no limites as to the area required for scientific validity.

There should no period in Alternative G during which forest managers have to work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan. That is like having a truck driver step into a operating room.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests should not be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is not needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Michael Goodner
22104 Lippencott Ct.
Burney, CA 96013

Email Letter EC-4

Response to Comment 1
Support for Alternative G noted.

Response to Comment 2
Opposition to limitations on silviculture and the JDSF advisory committee noted.

EC-35

Sipson, Lisa

From: dartley@connectwireless.us
Posted At: Friday, June 15, 2007 9:26 PM
Conversation: Comments on Alt. G for Jackson State Forest
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Comments on Alt. G for Jackson State Forest

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I retired from the US Forest Service in 2003. In 1980 I received a master of forestry degree from Oregon State University. The USFS was kind enough to give me a 2 year educational leave of absence, if I agreed to work 10 more years for the agency after graduation.

1 The Forest Service seldom uses the regeneration Rx called clearcut anymore. In about 1993 or 1994 thet realized the ecosystem damage they were creating by emulating the often used method on private industrial lands.

Clearcutting is an effective cutting method if ever tree that grows is destined to become a commodity.

However, if the forest is multiple use (like most federal and state forests) I can think of nothing but an extraordinary situation when clearcutting might even be considered.

To plan for clearcutting on a multiple use forest tells me that either 1) the managers don't know what they are doing, or 2) they have a hidden agenda to stray from the multiple use objectives of the forest.

2 I would recommend that the plan for the Jackson forest be reviewed by an unbiased cadre of foresters and ecologists.

Sincerely,
Dick Artley
415 East North 2nd
Grangeville, ID 83530

1

Email Letter EC-35

Response to Comment 1
Opposition to clearcutting noted. JDSF is a research and demonstration forest and the proposed management is consistent with existing legislation. The silvicultural allocation is based on creating diverse stand and habitat types to maintain a viable outdoor laboratory and support a diverse research program. The Board contends that timber harvesting, including limited even-age management, is compatible with multiple use concepts. No significant adverse environmental impacts are expected. Please see General Response 2 and 10 for a discussion of the purpose of the state forest system and evenage management, respectively.

Response to Comment 2
The management plan and RDEIR represent careful consideration of input from a wide breadth of resource professionals.

EC-37

From: bherbert@slvwd.com
Posted At: Wednesday, June 27, 2007 3:32 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

FL Thanks to the Board for its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

1 I remain completely opposed to clearcutting on this State Forest. Managing in the public
2 interest, clearly does not mean managing primarily for timber production, regardless of the method of silviculture. Rather, it means managing primarily for other beneficial
3 public uses, such as wildlife habitat, water quality, and carbon sequestration. These benefits require restoration of the forest to mature seral stage, abandonment of forest roads and landings, and no-cut buffer zones along all streams.

Thus, I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group. I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the working group into
FL Alternative G.

I do support the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee.

It is time to move forward.

Yours truly, Betsy Herbert, Ph.D.

Sincerely,
Betsy Herbert
150 Thayer Rd.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

1

Email Letter EC-37

See Response to Comment Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 2
See General Response 2 and 16.

Response to Comment 3
One of the primary goals of the JDSF Management Plan is to achieve net improvements of conditions for all natural resources over time in comparison to existing conditions. The current plan is based on a monitoring and adaptive management feedback system. Goals are set for desired future conditions and monitoring is utilized to provide feedback regarding the effectiveness of management strategies in achieving those goals. Subsequent management actions will be modified as necessary to insure that resource conditions are on the correct trajectory to meet the stated management goals. The management plan represents state of the art management practices and implementation is not expected to produce significant adverse environmental impacts.

The protection and restoration of functioning ecological systems is given high priority. This includes managing all Class I and II WLPZs for development of late seral conditions (see General Response 11), a road management plan (see General Response 13), designation of 33% of the forest to some form of older forest structure (see General Response 8 and 9), and maintenance and enhancement of wildlife habitat (see General Response 12).

Forest growth will continue to exceed the planned harvest level by a wide margin, resulting in an increasing inventory and positive impacts related to carbon sequestration.

EC-38

From: jmuskratnorcal@yahoo.com
Posted At: Wednesday, June 27, 2007 7:12 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I hope that you can revise this measure to ensure the public that Jackson State Forest will be left for the tax payers to enjoy.
The unspecified "future research possibilities" statement is too vague.

Clearcuts have ruined ecosystems, steams and rivers, not to mention the scenery. A more sustainable approach to logging must be utilized before our state starts resembling Oregon and their awful clearcut lands.

I'm sure that a compromise can be reached before destroying what little is left of California's natural legacy.

Sincerely,
Jeff Musgrave
PO Box 28
Trinidad, CA 95570

Email Letter EC-38

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 15.

Response to Comment 2
See General Response 10.

EC-39

From: djconnel@yahoo.com
Posted At: Thursday, June 28, 2007 6:16 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the Mencino working group into Alternative G. It is critical that forest protection be real, and not subject to the economic pressures of big lumber.

Sincerely,
Daniel Connelly
996 De Haro St
San Francisco, CA 94107

Email Letter EC-39

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 17.

EC-41

From: avalencia@mcn.org
Posted At: Thursday, June 28, 2007 1:29 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

The Board of Forestry is to be lauded for responding in large part to the consensus achieved by members of Mendocino County working group on how Jackson State Forest should be managed.

1 I find it puzzling, however, that the agreement to restrain clear cutting--in particular, to restrict its use greatly and use only under clearly defined research circumstances--was not heeded. Frankly, it looks as if the leeway currently provided could counter all of the other beneficial practices included in Alternative G.

Please reconsider and incorporate the publicly desired guidelines on the practice of clear cutting in Jackson State Forest.

Sincerely,
Alis Valencia
18875 Trillium Lane
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Email Letter EC-41

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 10.

EC-42

Gipson, Lisa

s Silver [pacifictbird@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Saturday, July 14, 2007 3:59 PM
Conversation: New Alternative in Revised JSRF DEIR
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment
Subject: New Alternative in Revised JSRF DEIR

Date: 7/12/7

To: JDSFPublicComment@fire.ca.gov

From: Rodger Silvers

Re: Additional Alternative to Recirculated DEIR

Dear Board of Forestry and Fire Protection,

I'm surprised and saddened to learn that the latest alternative in the recirculated DEIR
1 allows clear-cutting across a quarter of Jackson State Redwood Forest. I also believe
after a review of the latest alternative, that the plan underestimates the need to combat
2 global warming. At the same time, it lacks safeguards and guarantees for preserving
3 JSRF natural heritage during proposed experimental, investigational, and scientific
processes.

Please make retaining and maximizing JSRF's green-house gas absorbing capacity
and preservation of its old growth heritage a greater priority. Please also replace
any clear-cutting in favor of defter and smarter harvesting of individuals trees.
Leave Jackson State Redword Forest in better shape than you found it -- not a hodge
podge of failed compromises and clear-cut death zones.

Thank you.

7/26/2007

Page 2 of 2

EC-42 cont.

Sincerely,

Rodger Silvers

Luggage? GPS? Comic books?
Check out fitting gifts for grads at Yahoo! Search.

Email Letter EC-42

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 2
Forest growth will continue to exceed the planned harvest level by a wide margin, resulting in an increasing inventory and positive impacts related to carbon sequestration. RDEIR, Table III.19 serves to rank the various alternatives in regards to carbon sequestration over the 100-year planning period. While the Board recognizes the importance of the environmental effects of global warming, requests to manage JDSF for a single purpose, such as maximizing carbon sequestration, will severely limit the research and demonstration potential of the forest. The diverse habitats created by a broad spectrum of management practices will allow for flexibility and opportunity for research as the issues and concerns involved in forest management evolve, including carbon sequestration.

In addition to the value that JDSF can provide directly, the demonstration of a broad range of management practices and the information gained from research on the forest can extend the value of JDSF beyond its borders. Land use conversion to non-forest uses, and the resulting emissions of green house gases, is an ongoing problem. By demonstrating economic forest management JDSF can serve to reduce this trend.

See also the response to DEIR comment letter E-116.

Response to Comment 3
See General Responses 8, 9, and 15.

EC-43

From: Brent Rusert [rusert@mcn.org]
Posted At: Monday, July 16, 2007 9:42 AM
Conversation: jdsf
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment
Subject: jdsf

Sirs,

1 what continues to occur to me as I peruse both the draft EIR and alternative G is why are you cutting any S. sempervirens, especially older ones?

2 Face it, in the foreseeable future JDSF needs to study the art of re-forestation, esp. on former industrial timberlands. Have our foresters do their research "in the field".

Thank you,

Brent Rusert
188 S. Harold St.
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
<rusert@mcn.org>
707 964 9360

"To destroy the invisible government, to dissolve the unholy alliance between corrupt business and corrupt politics is the first task of the statesmanship of the day". Theodore Roosevelt 1912

Email Letter EC-43

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 2, 9, and 16.

Response to Comment 2
JDSF is “former industrial timberland” that through reforestation efforts has developed into a largely healthy young growth forest. JDSF continues to be available for a wide variety of forest research, including reforestation and restoration. See also General Response 15.

EC-44

From: Alea Waters [aleawaters@pacific.net]
Posted At: Monday, July 16, 2007 11:15 AM
Conversation: Support the Mendocino County Working Group rec's re: JacksonState Forest!
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Support the Mendocino County Working Group rec's re: JacksonState Forest!

Dear BOF:

1 This letter is to URGE you to PLEASE support the recommendations of the Mendocino County Working Group regarding MINIMIZING CLEARCUTTING IN JACKSON STATE FOREST BY RESTRICTING CLEARCUTTING TO CLEARLY JUSTIFIED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR FOR FOREST HEALTH.
These recommendations need o be INCORPORATED INTO ALTERNATIVE G - as recommended, not only by the M.C. Working Group, but by the Mendocino County Board of Supervisor's UNANIMOUS VOTE.
Clearly this is the will of the people of Mendocino County. You, as agency representatives, have a DUTY to carry out the will of the citizen's whose taxes pay your salaries!
Please respond. Thank you,
Alea Waters, RN

Email Letter EC-44

Response to Comment 1
Public comment was encouraged throughout the development of the DFMP and EIR process and the comments and recommendations of the Mendocino working group, the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors and the people of Mendocino County have been carefully considered.

The Board and CAL FIRE are responsible for developing a management plan for JDSF that is consistent with existing legislation and supports the research and demonstration mandate of the state forest system. Timber harvesting, including the allocation of various silvicultural prescriptions, under the ADFFMP is based on providing a varied landscape with a set of forest structures designed to support a diverse research and demonstration program. See also General Response 2 and 10.

EC-45

From: Alea Waters [aleawaters@pacific.net]
Posted At: Monday, July 16, 2007 11:31 AM
Conversation: Incorporate Recommended Clearcutting Restrictions into JacksonState Alternative G!
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Incorporate Recommended Clearcutting Restrictions into JacksonState Alternative G!

Dear BOF -

1 This email is to urge you to incorporate the clearcutting restrictions outlined by the Mendocino Working Group, and unanimously supported by the Mendocino County Supervisors, into Alternative G, for Jackson State Forest.
Clearly, THIS IS THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE.

2 These proposals will restrict clearcutting to clearly justified cases of scientific research or forest health only.

3 This is a public forest owned by the people. We have been working for years to save it from the saw, and to preserve a valuable Mendocino County resource for ourselves, our children and our grandchildren.

4 The forest was never intended to be handed to logging corporations for their profit making ends. It has required tremendous work from the citizen's of Mendocino County to prevent the destruction of Jackson State Forest.

5 As agency representatives, it is your responsibility to carry out the will of the people, whose hard earned tax-dollars are paying your salaries.
ADOPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS INTO ALTERNATIVE G.

Thank you for your attention. Please respond.

Lang Russell
langrussel@pacific.net

Email Letter EC-45

Response to Comment 1
See Email Letter EC-44, Response to Comment 1 above.

Response to Comment 2
See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 3
See General Response 15.

Response to Comment 4
See General Response 2, 16, and 17.

Response to Comment 5
See Email Letter EC-44, Response to Comment 1 above.

EC-48

Jameson, Marc

From: Leddy, Jeff
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2007 8:01 AM
To: Jameson, Marc
Subject: FW: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

-----Original Message-----
From: dirctor@MendocinoWoodlands.org [mailto:dirctor@MendocinoWoodlands.org]
Posted At: Monday, July 16, 2007 3:50 PM
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

July 15, 2007

Board of Forestry and Fire Protection PO Box 944246 Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear Members of the Board:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Mendocino Woodlands Camp Association and the
1 thousands of campers that attend the Mendocino Woodlands annually, we are strongly urging you to adopt Alternative G for the management of Jackson State Forest.
In addition, I am addressing a small corner of the Jackson State Forest that has an immense impact on the Mendocino Woodlands.
That portion is now referred to as the Mendocino Woodlands Special Treatment Area (STA).
2 Our goal at MWCA is the complete restoration of the original park, from all of the buildings and structures in the state park, to the reunification of the STA with the Woodlands. We intend, at this time, to address this issue of reunification of the land to its original boundaries.
Following are background and reasons.

3 Without access to the unspoiled trails within the STA, the public?s experience would be severely limited. There are only four complete trails within the confines of the narrow 720 acres of the park. Altogether they total about 3 miles; a mere 12% of the 25 miles presently available to the visitor.
The STA that surrounds the Woodlands has been the subject of much discussion and confusion over the years. Originally, it was part of a grand park created by the federal government, which was then called the Mendocino Woodlands Recreation Demonstration Area.
The following negative impacts are compelling reasons for the complete cessation of timber harvests in the Mendocino Woodlands Special Treatment Area.
4 1. Camping experiences for the public would be greatly spoiled by noise and dust, thereby causing diminished use of this historic park.
5 2. Hiking/Camping experiences for the public would be greatly spoiled by the view of cut-down trees, also causing diminished use of this historic park.
6 3. Available trails would be greatly reduced.
7 4. Degradation of watershed.
8 5. The Little North Fork of the Big River would have additional silt, impeding salmon?s ability to spawn.
Because of its very close proximity and the fact that the STA overlooks the entire park, we feel strongly that the STA should be reintegrated into the Mendocino Woodlands State
9 Park, thereby permanently protecting the STA from future timber harvests and preserving the peace and beauty for which the public comes to the Woodlands, as originally mandated.

1

At this time, the Mendocino Woodlands Camp Association respectfully requests that the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection consider these possible solutions to the challenges involving the STA:

10 1. The Special Treatment Area be transferred into the jurisdiction of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, thus ending many years of costly management conflicts and preserving, intact, the original RDA. CDF would not be giving up any investment on their part as the entire Mendocino Woodlands Recreation Area was given to the people of California as a gift.

2. Set the STA aside, with no harvesting activity, as a baseline example of how the redwoods can heal themselves and become old growth once again.

3. If the California Department of Forestry feels that they must manage the forest to bring about old growth characteristics, then use the south side of the STA, which is not contiguous with the rest of Jackson State Forest, as a baseline example of how the redwoods can heal themselves and become old growth once again, and manage the north side with an easy hand, with clearly stated limitations and practices, to insure the public that this land will be treated with the public?s use and enjoyment in mind.

We understand that the board has a big challenge in dealing with the Jackson State Forest and thank you for your time and consideration on this matter.

Don Taylor Executive Director Mendocino Woodlands Camp Association

Sincerely,
Mendocino Woodlands
PO Box 267
Mendocino, CA 95460

2

Email Letter EC-48

Response to Comment 1
The Board duly notes the urging of the comment to adopt Alternative G.

Response to Comment 2
The Board notes the comment's proposal to put the Woodlands STA and the Woodlands Park under unified management.

Response to Comment 3
The Board does not intend to preclude access to the recreational trails within the Woodlands Special Treatment Area. These trails have been identified within the management plan, and will be afforded with the protection specified therein. In addition, Alternative G proposes to designate the STA as a Late Seral Development Area, with the exception of the existing Railroad Gulch research area, which was selectively harvested in the 1980s. Significant impacts to recreational resources or aesthetics are not expected to occur.

Response to Comment 4
The potential impacts upon recreational resources have been considered, and no significant impacts are expected to occur. Any future project contemplated to occur within the STA will include a site-specific assessment of potential impacts to aesthetic resources, recreational use, watershed resources. This assessment would include potential impacts associated with noise, dust, erosion, slope stability, vegetative disturbance. In addition, the Department's management within the STA is constrained by the existing Memorandum of Understanding between CAL FIRE and DPR. The legislation that established the park and STA also specifies that the CAL FIRE must consult with the Department of Parks and Recreation concerning matters that may affect the park. Please see DEIR Sections VII.2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14 and Section VIII).

Response to Comment 5
One of the primary purposes of the Woodlands Camp, as established by the Legislature, is childhood education, including education concerning resources conservation and utilization. Due to the designation of most of the STA as a Late Seral Development Area, any timber operations in areas so designated would be selective in nature, involving primarily light timber removal. Only a single timber operation is proposed for this area in the Short-Term Harvest Schedule (RDEIR Alterntive G, Table II.3); the continuation of a study that demonstrates forms of uneven-aged management. This harvest project, when planned in detail, will include an assessment of potential impacts to aesthetics, recreational resources, and watershed resources. Significant impacts to recreational resources and aesthetics are not expected to occur.

Response to Comment 6
There will be no reductions in the availability of trails as the result of timber harvest, though directly affected trail segments may be temporarily closed.

Response to Comment 7
Please see DEIR Section VII.10) for an assessment of potential effects to watershed resources. No significant impacts are expected to occur.

Response to Comment 8
Please see DEIR Section 6.1 for an assessment of potential effects to aquatic resources. No significant impacts are expected to occur.

Response to Comment 9
The National Park Service purchased this land primarily from various large timber ownerships within a few years of clearcut logging of the area. After constructing a camp and trails in the area, the Service deeded the land to the State of California, after 10 to 15 years of National ownership. The area was incorporated into the state forest with the knowledge that forest management would eventually occur.

Please see earlier responses above. No significant impacts to the Woodlands STA and Park are expected to occur.

Response to Comment 10
The Board duly notes the suggested alternative management options for the Woodlands STA.

EC-49

PO Box 256
Philo, CA 95466
707-895-3716
kb@pacific.net

California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
JDSFPublicComment@fire.ca.gov
1416 – 9th Street
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Jackson Forest RDEIR Alternative G

Dear Board Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on behalf of California Sierra Club on the new Alternative G in the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR) for management of Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF). As you know, I have been following Jackson-related issues since about
1 1996. I hereby incorporate by reference the letter dated February 27, 2006 which I sent on behalf of Sierra Club regarding the Draft EIR (DEIR). If the final EIR document is to make sense, many of the criticisms that I addressed about the DEIR, particularly the erroneous nonsense in some of the map figures like Map K and Map R, just for example, must be fixed.

2 This letter is also in addition to the letter I signed with others calling ourselves the Mendocino Working Group, which was submitted to the record earlier. The concerns raised in that letter are a consensus effort of representatives of the local timber industry and environmental community to identify some concerns we hold in common.

Additional Information is Needed

Some of the informational requests I made in Sierra Club's previous letter have been included or partially included in Alternative G. Map Figure 2 of Alternative G does provide a useful visual representation of where stands that
3 contain more old large trees are located. It would have been even better if you had also included the map you generated and handed out to various members of the public dated April 27, 2006 entitled "Second-Growth Stands Regenerated Prior to 1926." The combination of this map and Map Figure 2 provide a much more complete representation of the older second growth stands at Jackson that the conservation community is particularly concerned about than either does alone. Given that this information is needed to make the most informed decision about management at JDSF, the RDEIR is incomplete without it and it should be included in the Final.

The language in Alternative G's first Goal and Objective section illustrates one of the reasons why the most complete information on older forest stands is important:

> **Goal #1 - RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION:** Improve the amount and quality of information concerning economic forest ~~management~~ and timber management, forest ecosystem processes, watershed processes, performance of forest protection measures, that is available to the general public, ~~small~~ forest landowners, resource professionals, timber operators, ~~and~~ the timber industry, and researchers.
>
> Objectives:
>
> Maintain a diverse, dynamic matrix of forest habitats and seral stages to provide a broad range of forest conditions available for research and demonstration.
>
> Make the State Forest available to educational institutions and other agencies for conducting research and demonstration projects.
>
> Conduct resource management demonstrations and investigations directed to the needs of the general public, small forest landowners, resource professionals, timber operators, and the timber industry.
>
> Design a range of demonstrations and comparisons to serve a broad set of clients such as conservation-oriented, restoration-oriented, small landowner, and intensive production approaches to forest management.

4 To be able to achieve Objectives 1 and 4 above, the RDEIR must include the known relevant information about older forest stands. Without the stand harvest history information, one can only speculate why the forest stands within the Camp Three and Brandon Gulch THPs outlined in Figure 2 are more dense with larger trees than are the stands adjacent on the northeast, southeast and west as indicated in Figure 2. However, a quick look at the 4/27/06 "Regenerated Prior to 1926" map indicates that those denser stands were "not harvested" since at least 1926, while the neighboring stands were "partially harvested" since 1926. This is useful information for anyone trying to design an experiment about or within older forest, and for those who are trying to determine where to locate late seral development areas or old forest structure zones, both of which are categories that are designated in the RDEIR.

5 An EIR is supposed to be a public disclosure document that assists the public in determining the environmental effects of proposed government action. Thus, the public should not need to come into the process with copious personal knowledge about why certain actions have been taken. The EIR is supposed to adequately describe the setting and provide information about proposed

2

actions and their effect on the environment. The RDEIR fails in these tasks on a number of counts:

6 It uses an overly broad region on which to base its statements about the regional condition of older forest stands, so the RDEIR understates how important the older forest stands at Jackson are to the regional ecology.

7 It fails to explain why the Camp Three and Brandon Gulch areas have not been designated for "late seral development" even though they appear to be obvious candidates for inclusion: These THP areas are adjacent or in close proximity to an existing late seral development area which would enhance the utility of the area to regionally rare wildlife and would maintain an existing old tree corridor; The forest stands in these THP areas are rare even in the context of Jackson (Map Figure 2 indicates both areas as growing 15-20 trees per acre greater than 30" diameter at breast height (DBH)); And these areas have not been harvested for at least the last 82 years according to the 4/27/2006 map that
8 has not been included in the RDEIR. Yet the RDEIR provides no rationale for logging them as proposed, nor for failing to designate these areas for "late seral development." Through personal knowledge I understand why decision-makers wish to designate these areas for immediate harvest. However, I have never personally understood, nor has there ever been an adequate justification for why these areas have not been designated for late seral development and nothing in the RDEIR provides any information about that. This is significant information and it is missing in the RDEIR.

Old Forest Structure Zone

9 The Old Forest Structure Zone needs work. On multiple occasions such as at public hearings and at the Mendocino Board of Supervisors, I have heard Deputy Director Russ Henly describe the Old Forest Structure Zone (OFSZ) as stretching from west to east and north to south in Jackson providing a contiguous band of old forest structure across the forest. The reality is somewhat different. The RDEIR says:

> Establishment of an Older Forest Structure Zone (OFSZ) (D, E & F)
>
> A 6,803 acre area of the Forest, ranging across the Forest from west to east and north to south, is designated to be managed as an Older Forest Structure Zone (see Map Figure 1). The objective of this form of management is to produce structural characteristics of older forest, which include large trees, snags, down logs, and a high level of structural diversity, across a large contiguous area that also includes existing old growth groves and areas designated for the development of late seral forest characteristics. The portions of this Zone available for timber management would be managed on an uneven-aged basis to recruit these structural conditions and wildlife habitat elements, to coincidentally grow and produce timber through careful thinnings and periodic replacement of large trees and to provide recreational opportunities.

9 ctd An examination of Alternative G Map Figure 1 clearly indicates that the OFSZ as currently designated does not at any location dip south of the mid-point of Jackson Forest and except for a very limited number of locations could actually be more accurately described as "running from west to east along the northern boundary of the forest." Why does it matter? Because the sort of old forest structure it is supposed to create would be more effective at providing both contiguous habitat and recreation opportunities if it crossed from the Noyo watershed over to the Big River watershed in the western part of the forest where existing old forest structure currently exists. Providing OFSZ south of Highway 20 would also help bridge the somewhat formidable obstacle of this major highway.

10 Besides the failure of the OFSZ to meet the rhetorical flourish of its description, it also fails to include some obvious locations along West Chamberlain Creek, an area that has high recreation use by people going to the Eric Swanson Old Growth Waterfall Grove. Including OFSZ along this stretch would protect an existing scenic corridor that has a lot of residual old growth trees still growing and would also provide another way to link into the Big River watershed. At 76
11 square miles, Jackson should be providing a number of old forest corridors to link the Noyo River drainage, the Big River drainage, and some of the smaller coastal streams such as Jughandle Creek. Considering the OFSZ will allow certain types of timber harvest, expanding the OFSZ would allow Jackson to cultivate the high quality mature timber that the City of Ft. Bragg has asked you to develop for future harvest.

12 The RDEIR should also clarify what is intended in "late seral development" zones as compared to "old forest structure zones." The intended differences are not clear in the document.

13 James Creek area is another place where the OFSZ should be reconsidered. The designation of the isolated and terrifically steep easternmost edge of the ridge as OFSZ is not without merit, but inclusion of the area along Road 100 following North James Creek to where it meets the lovely James Creek Old Growth Grove should also be considered because the riparian area there is interesting, it leads directly to the old growth, there is a high level of visitor use from the Willits area particularly, and scattered old growth residuals leading to the old growth grove make the area a good base for the OFSZ.

Jughandle Ecological Staircase Marbled Murrelet Critical Habitat

14 The headwaters of Jughandle Creek are another area that the EIR should pay closer attention to. This area is adjacent to Jughandle State Park, which includes the unique-in-the-world "Ecological Staircase" where in a relatively short walk one can proceed through very different forest cover types that arise due to the changing underlying geology. Much of the Pygmy Forest part of the staircase, which is unique to the Mendocino Coast, is located on Jackson and is managed by CDF and State Parks jointly as the Pygmy Forest Preserve. The Pygmy is adjacent to the final step in the ecological staircase, located on

4

14 cont'd

Jackson, and it is a forest stand that, according to RDEIR Map 2, has 12-15 trees per acre greater than 30 inch DBH and has only been "partially harvested" since 1926 according to the 4/27/2006 map. Yet this unique area is slated under Alternative G for near-term timber harvest as the south unit of the Mitchell Creek THP. This is literally the only location on earth where this stair-step condition exists and except for its final step it is already protected. If this is not a unique resource that shouldn't be disturbed I would be hard pressed to describe what is. Additionally, the US Fish and Wildlife Service has published its intent to continue to designate this area as Critical Habitat for the federal and state-listed Marbled Murrelet because of its stand condition and propinquity to known nesting marbled murrelets in the Russian Gulch watershed. The RDEIR fails to identify these issues or provide any rationale for why the forest around the headwaters of Jughandle Creek is proposed for timber harvest. This is an unidentified significant impact.

This letter, if read in conjunction with the letter from the Mendocino Working Group, identifies some of Sierra Club's highest priority concerns with Alternative G. Most of these are the very same concerns Sierra Club has been voicing about Jackson for the last decade or thereabouts. Alternative G provides an adequate framework from which to address these concerns so for the first time there is really the possibility that a resolution to much of the controversy could be achieved. We strongly encourage you to continue to work toward achieving such a resolution.

Sincerely,

Kathy Bailey

Kathy Bailey
Forest Conservation Committee
California Sierra Club

Attachment: See fax for 4/27/2006 map

5

Email Letter EC-49

Response to Comment 1
The comment requests that an earlier letter be incorporated with the more recent letter by reference. A response has been prepared to the environmental concerns expressed in the earlier letter; see response to DEIR comment letter P-188.

Response to Comment 2
The comment informs the Board of an additional letter submitted by the Mendocino Working Group. The Board acknowledges this letter.

Response to Comment 3
The commenter would have preferred that an additional map be included in Alternative G. The map in question is an estimate of harvest history produced by Department staff, based upon local harvest records and professional judgment (Russ Henly, personal communication). The map was provided to Ms. Bailey at her request, and was considered DRAFT material. The comment states that the addition of the map would help to identify older second growth stands that the conservation community is concerned about. The DEIR and RDEIR include a comprehensive assessment of the potential for impacts to forest resources, including watersheds and wildlife (see DEIR Sections cite and cite).

The value of forested areas as wildlife habitat is determined by structure and relationship to the broader landscape. Various written and graphic depictions of forest structure are incorporated into the DEIR. Forest structure is extremely diverse, and affected by harvesting, fire, soil productivity, vegetative regeneration and development, underlying geology, and management history. The final management plan reflects consideration of legislation, policy, and potential environmental effects. While it is possible that many other potential information sources may increase the ability to characterize certain aspects of the Forest resources, such as "older second growth", the Board utilized the appropriate level of available information.

Response to Comment 4
The comment states that achievement of Goal 1, Objectives 1 and 4 must include known relevant information about older forest stands. Further, the comment states that one can only speculate why the forest stands within the Camp Three and Brandon Gulch THPs are more dense with larger trees than adjacent stands. The comment states that a map of forest history produced by the Department (see Response 3 above) is needed to inform the decision concerning where on the landscape to locate late seral development areas or old forest structure zones.

The RDEIR includes information on the history of the Forest and the structure of the forest stands. Further, the RDEIR clearly describes the range of habitats and seral stages that will be produced over time (Page II-7). The diameter distribution (number of trees by size) of trees within various stands or areas of the Forest is quite variable, and can be estimated by various means. This distribution is potentially affected by harvesting history, soil productivity, species of trees, and other factors. A combination of these factors accounts for a high estimate to trees over 30 inches in diameter within the two THP areas relative to other adjacent areas. The resultant forest structure is one of a number of considerations used in the allocation of land area to late seral development and older forest structure development in the long term. It will take another 100 to 400 years for this future structure to develop, depending upon many factors. The location of these features on the landscape is a much more important consideration than the timber harvest history, which is not a definitive indicator of forest structure in many cases.

The late seral development areas and older forest structure zone were situated on the landscape primarily in consideration of proximity to known or potential habitat for endangered species, not timber harvest history. These areas were also placed in a manner that provides linking habitat or corridor for wildlife.

Response to Comment 5
The comment states that the EIR is supposed to be a public disclosure document to assist the public in determining the environmental effects of proposed government action, and that the public should not need to bring personal knowledge to the EIR process. The EIR should adequately describe the setting and proposed actions. The comment states that the RDEIR fails on this account (see Responses below).

The Board has produced an EIR that adequately describes the project, proposed actions, the environmental setting, and potential environmental effects. However, the Board, in preparation of the EIR, is unable to speculate concerning the nature of specific detailed information that any member of the public may wish to be provided or included in the analysis.

Response to Comment 6
The comment states that the RDEIR uses an overly broad region on which to base consideration of regional condition of older forest stands, thus understating the importance of older forest stands at JDSF to regional ecology.

Since the concern is not explained in sufficient detail, making an appropriate response is difficult. The term "older forest stands" is not described in the literature. It is a relative term. The literature most often attributes habitat and ecological value to forest structure conditions, which are quite variable. The RDEIR includes the best available information on forest habitat structure within an assessment area that includes the Noyo and Big River watersheds (DEIR Section VII.6.6, Map Figure J). The document also includes a discussion of forest and habitat resources within the greater redwood region (DEIR Section VII.6.6). This is an appropriate level of consideration for the EIR.

Response to Comment 7
The comment states that the RDEIR fails to describe why two specific areas were not designated for late seral development, though in her opinion, they appear to be obvious candidates for inclusion.

The designation of late seral development areas within the Forest is intended to provide for future development of habitat for a broad range of species. This is intended as a restoration effort, as well as an effort to produce a broad set of forest conditions available for research and demonstration. The Board does not intend to include, nor would it be appropriate to designate all potentially suitable stands in late seral development area. Virtually the entire forest is potentially suitable for eventual development of late seral forest conditions.

The comment states that inclusion of the two THP areas would enhance the utility of the area for regionally rare wildlife and maintain an existing old tree corridor. Further, she states that these stands are rare even in the context of JDSF.

The Board has fully considered the potential impacts of management upon threatened and endangered species (DEIR VII.6.1, VII.6.2, VII.6.6 and RDEIR III-22 to III-58). This is an important consideration, though not the only consideration of the Board in consideration of the management of JDSF. These are young redwood stands, located in an area designated for forms of uneven-aged or selection management. The future development of late seral and older forest was considered in a spatial context, and was intended primarily to enhance future habitat values, largely as a restoration effort. Speculation concerning enhancing the utility of this area for regionally rare wildlife was not the Board's sole consideration.

There is no legal definition or legal determination mechanism for the rarity of young forest stands. Based upon structural characteristics, there is an abundant area of JDSF with characteristics similar to the two THP areas cited above by the commenter. The Board is not aware of any regional inventory or characterization of young forest stands based upon age or management history.

Response to Comment 8
The RDEIR provides no rationale for harvesting the Brandon Gulch or Camp Three THP areas, nor for failing to designate them as late seral development area.

JDSF was established by the legislature specifically for the purpose of demonstration of economical timber management. The potential for significant impacts to occur as the direct result of harvesting in the Forest has been considered (DEIR Sections VII and VIII inclusive). The rationale for harvesting these areas can be found in the legislation, Board policy, regulation, and the RDEIR.

Response to Comment 9
The comment states that the physical location of the Older Forest Structure Zone does not match the description in the RDEIR.

The physical location of the Older Forest Structure Zone is clearly depicted on RDEIR Map Figure 1. This location matches the written description, though the written description is not intended to provide sufficient detail to enable an exact mapping of the zone.

The comment states that the zone would be more effective for providing contiguous habitat and recreational opportunities if it crossed from the Noyo watershed into the Big River watershed in the western part of the forest where existing old forest structure currently exists, and would help to bridge the obstacle of Highway 20. This suggestion is duly noted by the Board.

Many alternatives to enhance or optimize various aspects of future habitat development and recreational opportunity may exist, but it is the Board's intention to provide for effective management of the Forest in compliance with existing legislation and Board policy, in consideration of potential environmental effects. The comment has not indicated that a significant impact is expected as the result of the proposal outlined in the RDEIR, but recommends and requests consideration of specific changes that are not well explained and speculative in nature. The entire area of JDSF represents habitat for aquatic or terrestrial species. The area adjacent to Highway 20 is forested, and will remain forested in various stages of habitat development and structure. Please see DEIR Sections VII.6.6 and 14 for the assessment of potential impacts to wildlife and recreational resources.

Response to Comment 10
The comment suggests that the Older Forest Structure Zone be amended to include locations along the west fork of Chamberlain Creek, since it is an area of high recreational use, and it would protect an existing scenic corridor that has a lot of residual old growth trees, also providing another link into the Big River watershed.

The comment's suggestions are duly noted. As stated in Response 9, virtually the entire area of JDSF is forested habitat. The comment suggests that the Older Forest Structure Zone be expanded into the Chamberlain Creek area. This zone was not a necessity to prevent a significant impact wildlife, but is an attempt on the part of the Board to provide additional habitat for a broad range of species that utilize this forest structure. The Board recognizes that the roads and trails in this area are traveled by recreationalists, and that scattered residual old growth trees can be found in the area. The large old trees and those smaller old trees with structural characteristics of value to wildlife will be preserved (ADFFMP Chapter 3). In addition, the main traveled roadway up the west fork of Chamberlain Creek is designated as a Road and Trail Corridor, within which only a limited range of silviculture may be utilized in order to maintain forested views. This road also lies primarily within the Watercourse and Lake Protection Zone, which is designated as a Late Seral Development Area. Lastly, the Waterfall Grove and Older Forest Structure Zone extend partially down the west fork of Chamberlain Creek, and include the headwaters of the west fork (RDEIR Map Figure 1). Any future proposal to harvest timber in this watershed will incorporate an assessment of potential aesthetic impacts (DEIR Sections VII.2 and 14).

Response to Comment 11
The comment states that JDSF should be providing a number of old forest corridors to link the Noyo, Big River, and small coastal watersheds. This would also provide an opportunity to develop the high quality products that the City of Fort Bragg has requested.

The comment's suggestions are duly noted. The management plan includes provisions to develop late seral or older forest structure on a third of the forest area. The stream protection zones form a web across the entire forest, and this web connects to the late seral development areas, old growth groves, and older forest structure zone. The comment suggests that additional area be designated for this purpose. Based upon the analysis performed for the EIR, the Board has determined that significant impacts to wildlife are not expected to occur.

The City of Fort Bragg has requested that JDSF produce large logs from mature young forest stands. It is the intention of the Board, as provided in the management plan, to produce high levels of these high quality forest products. Through implementation of selective forest management, long-rotation even-aged management, and limited harvest within the Older Forest Structure Zone, an abundance of high quality forest products will result, in compliance with the request by the City of Fort Bragg and others.

Response to Comment 12
The comment requests that what is intended in late seral development areas when compared to older forest structure zones is not clear.

Late seral development is described in various terms within the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan (ADFFMP). The stated intention is to develop stand and habitat conditions typical of late seral forests. This would include larger, older trees, with structural characteristics of old trees (e.g. large trunks, large limbs, cavities, broken or multiple tops). At the stand level, this may include multiple canopy layers and understory vegetation. The ADFFMP points out that these conditions will not be created over the life of the plan, but over a much longer period. Some of the potential stand treatments mentioned include light thinning, thinning from below, understory burning, and other treatments designed with the intention of accelerating the development of late seral conditions, including habitat for the marbled murrelet (ADFFMP Chapter 3).

The objective of the Older Forest Structure Zone is also to produce structural characteristics of older forest, including large trees, snags, down logs, and a high level of structural diversity. Management of these areas would be on an uneven-aged basis.

Perhaps the largest contrast between the two designations is that within the Older Forest Structure Zone, one objective is to grow and produce timber through careful thinnings and periodic replacement of large trees. One of the key elements of Late Seral Development is the actual development of large and old trees and an old forest, which is to be sustained. The Older Forest Structure Zone, by contrast, will focus upon development of structural characteristics of older forests while being available for periodic harvest and replacement of the larger trees (RDEIR Alternative G).

Response to Comment 13
The comment suggests that OFSZ designation should be considered for the James Creek area. The primary reasons cited by the comment are that the riparian area there is interesting, it leads directly to the James Creek old growth grove, there is a particularly high level of visitor use from the Willits area particularly, and there are scattered old growth trees which provide a good base for the OFSZ.

The comment is duly noted by the Board. The RDEIR includes a graphic depiction of the OFSZ (Map Figure 1). The OFSZ includes a swath of the James Creek watershed that connects the James Creek old growth grove and other old groves in James Creek to the watercourse protection zone throughout James Creek, including most of the concentrations of larger residual old growth trees known to exist and preserved within the various old growth groves.

Response to Comment 14

The comment suggests that closer attention be paid to the headwaters of Jughandle Creek, due primarily to it's proximity to the Ecological Staircase, the pygmy forest, the fact that Department data estimates 12 to 14 trees per acre greater than 30 inches in diameter, and due to the fact that this area is included in a draft proposal by the USFWS as critical habitat for the marbled murrelet. The comment suggests that this is a unique resource that shouldn't be disturbed, and that harvesting timber as proposed represents an unidentified significant impact.

The management plan will protect the pygmy forest and does not propose to affect the Ecological Staircase located within the adjacent designated State reserve. The DEIR specifically evaluated the potential to impact the pygmy plant community and associated cumulative effects. No significant impacts were identified (DEIR VII-6.2-34-35, 042). Virtually the entire forested area (with commercial timber species) located within the Jughandle Creek watershed upstream of the Staircase and located within JDSF has been managed on a selective basis since the 1960s. This form of management will continue, maintaining a managed forest landscape. This management is not expected to impact the adjacent pygmy forest or the Ecological Staircase, which is managed by the Department of Parks and Recreation. While it is a true statement that the Department has estimated that there are 12 to 15 conifer trees per acre greater than 30 inches in diameter in most of the watershed, the same holds true for a very large nearly contiguous area across the entire west and central areas of the Forest (see RDEIR Map Figure 2). This fact indicates that the forest stands within Jughandle Creek are not unique within the forest.

The pygmy forest is part of the Ecological Staircase. Upstream forest management operations have little if any potential to impact this area, due to physical separation by both topography and distance. Any proposed timber harvests within the Jughandle watershed would be required to evaluate impacts to the shared watershed insuring that the State Park would be protected. A significant level of environmental protection will be applied in all timber operations, which will protect downstream resources. Significant impacts are not expected to occur.

The upper reaches of Jughandle Creek are included in an area covered by a specific management measure (DEIR Section VII.6.6). Over the course of the coming few years, the management measure specifies that supplemental habitat needs of the marbled murrelet will be considered, and additional habitat may be designated for the species. No occupied habitat for the marbled murrelet is known to exist within the Jughandle Creek watershed at the present time. If any area is designated as critical marbled murrelet habitat, the EIR and Final Management Plan contain provisions for complying with appropriate consultation requirements.

EC70

From: oakes@mcn.org
Posted At: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 8:30 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I congratulate all parties who are working to help develop a sustainable, healthy forest and forest industry with the resource of the Jackson state forest.

However, any measure in the plan to manage the forest that allows for clear-cutting for any reason should not be allowed in any future timber harvest plan.

There has been plenty of clear cut areas in our county where "research" can be done to determine how to bring health back to these ecologically scarred areas of forest.

1 Any plan to do any additional clear cutting of any scale for "research" is an absolutely disgraceful smoke screen for continued ecological destruction.

For the economic and ecological health so that future generations can profit from our forest resource, it is imperative to develop ecologicaly healthy timber harvest plans. This type of "research" will have my whole hearted support.

Respectfully,

Baile Oakes-Bannon PO Box 203 Westport, CA 95488

Sincerely,
Robert Oakes Bannon
36000 N. Hwy 1
"Westport, CA", CA 95488

Email Letter EC-70

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 10.

EC89

Gipson, Lisa

	rmcoppock@comcast.net
Posted At:	Tuesday, June 19, 2007 11:19 AM
Conversation:	Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To:	Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment
Subject:	Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

FL 9

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

1

In the EIR, there is a matrix showing the different kinds of procedures, along with potential dmage. A major effect category is insignificant damage with mitigation. You seem to have discovered an interesting new meaning for insignificant, or mitigation, or both. Group selection of old trees, can't realy be mitigated in less than 1000 years. The new trees aren't like the old trees, and the ecoculture will always be diffrent.

FL 9

I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Robert Coppock
32611 Albion Ridge C Rd
Albion, CA 95410

Email Letter EC-89

Response to Comment 1

No definition of "Old Trees" is provided. The commenter seems to suggest that 1000 year old trees will be harvested using group selection silviculture. There are no plans to utilize group selection harvesting in old growth groves. See General Response 8 for a discussion of old growth protection measures. See also the response to Form Letter 9.

EC 94

Gipson, Lisa

From: edwebnetjds@yahoo.com
Posted At: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 3:30 PM
Conversation: Spam: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Spam: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I strongly oppose Alternative G.

Please, do not approve it.

1 We need a comprehensive, long-term forest management plan, that is as fair as possible to all concerned parties.

Therefore, all the suggestions heard during the period of public comment last year, and this year, should be included into the comprehensive plan.

2 New forest products need to be developed, and new methods of harvesting these new forest products need to be demonstrated, along with the development and implementation of rules to regulate this harvest of new forest materials. Therefore, specific areas need to be set aside for the development of these new forest products, and forest managers need to be assigned to administrate this new harvest.

Fire prevention methods also need to be developed, implemented and demonstrated at Jackson State Forest.

3 The provisions made by the Sierra Club, and other environmental groups, which include both protections for Old Growth trees, or those trees that were in place and alive before 1850, and a ban on clear-cutting throughout the forest, should also be included into the comprehensive, long-term forest management plan which needs to be developed.

4 Other public comment throughout the last two years has called for the construction of more campsites and hiking trails, along with other development for recreational use, the construction of facilities and sites to promote education and research activities and uses, and these requests need to be included into this comrehensive, long-term forest management plan.

5 Additionally, an effective, long-term management plan needs to consider the acquisition of additional lands, for example the need to include the upper level tributaries within the James Creek watershed, along with long-term plans to restore important wildlife habitat areas and rehabitate streams, rivers and tributaries which have been damages, along with other forest restoration projects.

6 I applaud your efforts to include a large, protected area to be developed to promote Old Growth and a forested area with a thick canopy, which will eventually grow into a cathedral forest, and would like to suggest that it could be made to be even larger, perhaps 7,000 to 9,000 acres in size.

Thank you for your attention.

1

EC-94 cont.

I do not approve Alternative G.

James D. Smith P. O. Box 4225 Arcata, Ca. 95518

Sincerely,
James Smith
P. O. Box 4225
Arcata, CA 95518

Email Letter EC-94

The concerns and issues expressed in this email message have been considered and responses prepared. See Response to RDEIR mailed comment GM-28.

EC97

Gipson, Lisa

From: rayduff@mcn.org
Posted At: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 5:53 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

FL 9 I write to give my opinion on Alternative G. The Board of Forestry has done well in activity to protect Jackson State Forest for public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

I do oppose giving the forest managers any authority to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." Further research is needed on forest restoration, not on forest destruction.

1 Alternative G in its present form should not be supported. Our Governor has made it clear California should show leadership in reconstruction of our environment. Clearcut or similar destructive harvest methods do not contribute to reduction in harmful hydrocarbons. The Mendocino County working group recommend explicit research and any justification be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity.

2 During the most recent period forest managers have worked with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan. This is a better way to manage the Forest.

FL 9 All proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

I want to end the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Ray Duff
Box 46
Caspar, CA, CA 95420

Email Letter EC-97

See response to Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
The management of JDSF will result in a net capture of green house gasses. See also EC-42, Response to Comment 2 and E-116 (2005 DEIR) response.

Response to Comment 2
See General response 18.

EC 100

Ginson, Lisa

From: dgermanking@aol.com
Posted At: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 7:27 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

FL 9

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

1 Clear cutting is not acceptable. It damages rivers and streams and destroys the land that is cut by increasing erosion. Please do not allow this destructive practice.

FL 9

I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Dean Cobb
5837 Morgan Place #99
Stockton, CA 95219

Email Letter EC-100

Response to Comment 1
A detailed discussion of landslides and erosion, including management goals, proposed management actions, potential impacts, and mitigation measures, can be found in Section VII.7 of the DEIR. As part of the management plan special concern areas were identified, including those areas at high risk of slope failure. Implementation of a Road Management Plan (see General Response 13) and Hillslope Management to provide for slope stability, including input from a Certified Engineering Geologist, will be utilized to reduce the risk of management related adverse impacts associated with landslides and surface erosion.

Additional protection measures relating to mass wasting, surface erosion, road management, and riparian vegetation can be found in Chapter 3 of the DFMP or ADFFMP, and also are discussed in various sections of the DEIR (VII.6.6 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat, VII.7 Geology and Soils, VII.10 Hydrology and Water Quality, and VIII Cumulative Effects) and RDEIR.

Adoption of the ADFFMP, with regard to clearcutting and even-age management, is not expected to result in a significant adverse environmental impact. See also General Response 10 and Form Letter 9.

EC 101

From: madroneweb@aol.com
Posted At: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 8:24 PM
Conversation: Jackson Demonstration State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson Demonstration State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 I call upon the Board to think of restoration rather than allowing clearcutting of thousands of acres a year at Jackson Demonstration State Forest. Clearcut logging would negate the chances for decent marbled murrelet habitat to return to Jackson Forest -- and such habitat is needed in this area since unfortunately some scientists see chances of down-to-zero the chance for murrelets to still live south of the Humboldt County line before this half-century is out.

2 In some respects, I like certain improvements under new alternative G -- however, no additional clearcuts are needed either to study recovering from clearcuts at Jackson DSF or to study impacts of clearcuts and how best to recover from such harsh large-scale removal of vegetation leading to less stable hillsides, landslides and sedimentation, etc. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

FL 9 To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down to logging for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Once again, please follow the Mendocino County working group's recommendations in regards to possible clearcutting at Jackson forest. This is an important matter for those who know how decimated the redwood coastal region has become, and how the Schwarzenegger Administration will leave its mark in regards to nurturing or butchering redwood trees.

Sincerely,
Bruce Campbell
1158 26th St. #883
Santa Monica, CA 90403

69

Email Letter EC-101

Please see response to Mr. Campbell's February 24, 2006 (DEIR comment letter P-183) and July 12, 2007 (RDEIR comment letter GM-29) letters.

See also response to Comment Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
See GM-29, Response to Comment 1. The DEIR includes a Contribution to Recovery of Marbled Murrelet Habitat management measure (DEIR Page VII.6.6-118-119) and identifies areas specifically for the recruitment of Marbled Murrelet habitat (DEIR Page VII.6.6-78-82). Alternative G designates an additional 1,549 acres in the area of upper Russian Gulch and lower Big River for late seral development prescriptions specifically intended to recruit habitat for the marbled murrelet (see RDEIR Map Figure 1).

Response to Comment 2
A detailed discussion of landslides and erosion, including management goals, proposed management actions, potential impacts, and mitigation measures, can be found in section VII.7 of the DEIR. As part of the management plan special concern areas were identified, including those areas at high risk of slope failure. Implementation of a Road Management Plan (see General Response 13) and Hillslope Management to provide for slope stability, including input from a Certified Engineering Geologist, will be utilized to reduce the risk of management related adverse impacts associated with landslides and surface erosion.

Additional protection measures relating to mass wasting, surface erosion, road management, and riparian vegetation can be found in Chapter 3 of the DFMP or ADFFMP, and also are discussed in various sections of the DEIR (VII.6.6 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat, VII.7 Geology and Soils, VII.10 Hydrology and Water Quality, and VIII Cumulative Effects) and RDEIR.

Adoption of the ADFFMP, with regard to clearcutting and even-age management, is not expected to result in a significant adverse environmental impact. See also General Response 10.

EC110

From: hertzberg@colorado.edu
Posted At: Wednesday, June 20, 2007 1:47 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 I am a tourist from Colorado. Each year I and my family spend thousands of dollars to visit areas in the Jackson State forest, so I am very concerned about the future of the Forest. The idea that areas of the forest would be clearcut, simply to provide profit for the state and private companies, is distressing. The forest represents an important ecological resource that needs to be carefully managed to provide maximum benefit for all stakeholders.

FL 9 I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Jean Hertzberg
23 Wendelyn Way
Boulder, CO 80302

Email Letter EC-110

See Response to Comment Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 10, 15, and 16.

EC114

From: wcwong@mindspring.com
Posted At: Wednesday, June 20, 2007 8:54 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 I have appreciated the Jackson State Forest for its diverse habitat, its mature trees which nurture many dependent species of plants, fungi, animals, and birds. I am against wholesale clear cutting, for it is the mature trees which nurture the most diverse species of plants and animals. Fungi, for example, thrive under mature trees, and are fewer in number under immature ones.

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

FL 9 I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely yours, Carol and Weldon Wong 384 Fletcher Drive Atherton, CA 94027

Sincerely,
Weldon and Carol Wong
384 Fletcher Drive
Atherton,, CA 94027

Email Letter EC-114

See Response to Form Letter 9

Response to Comment 1
Species diversity, measured in sheer numbers, often increases both in early succession and in later seral stands that contain more complex structure including canopy gaps. Regarding fungi, the same trends have been observed in studies in Oregon. It would be interesting to conduct these studies at JDSF in redwood forests. For this type of research, harvested areas that include a range of ages and sites would need to be studied. Providing this range of forest conditions was a consideration in the guidance on clear cutting provided in Alternative G. See General Response 10.

EC120

annabeing@att.net
Posted At: Friday, June 22, 2007 4:08 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

FL 9

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

I must tell you why I think this. I actually live in another state, Colorado. In my state we are losing Thousands of acres of trees - mostly national forest - to pine bark beetles. Entire areas of forest have already bee wiped out. The first signs of the beetles have recently appeared in my county. And my county, like all of Colorado that is forested, depends on the forest for tourism income, among many other things.

1

It is almost incomprehensible to me, given the treasure that you have in Jackson State Forest, that you would clearcut any more trees than you absolutely have to.

Therefore, I cannot support Alternative G in its present form.
Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

FL 9

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Anna Schoettle
1868 Del Rosa Ct
Boulder, CO 80304

Email Letter EC-120

See Response to Form Letter 9

Response to Comment 1
The forests of Colorado are not ecologically similar to JDSF. Problems related to Colorado's forests are beyond the scope of this EIR process. Adoption of the ADFFMP, with regard to clearcutting and even-age management, is not expected to result in a significant adverse environmental impact. See also General Response 10, 14, and 15.

EC122

From: boxdhs@yahoo.com
Posted At: Saturday, June 23, 2007 2:26 PM
Conversation: Spam: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Spam: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

FL 9

I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group.

1

Research, as defined by Webster's dictionary states: careful, systematic, patient study and investigation in some field of knowledge undertaken to establish facts or principles. Now what I want to know, as a concerned citizen, is where are the previous research results published for public inspection?
The results from previous 'research treatment plans' would need to establish indisputable evidence, in the form of facts or principles, that further clear cutting or 'research' as it has been quaintly labeled is justified.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

FL 9

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
deborah shook
pobox 1830
mendocino, CA 95460

Email Letter EC-122

See Response to Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
Research and education are important components of the management plan. The Board agrees that research and demonstration results should be widely distributed. CAL FIRE is currently developing a website to catalogue the research and demonstration projects and/or publications that have been developed on the State forests (http://demoforests.net/). The website is incomplete, but the intention is to provide a comprehensive catalogue and a means to disseminate information, including data sets, regarding projects on the State forests. The commenter is encouraged to visit the website. This website will be moved to the main CAL FIRE website (http://www.fire.ca.gov/) in the near future. See also General Response 10.

EC123

From: cadile@msn.com
Posted At: Saturday, June 23, 2007 7:24 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

FL 9 I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health. However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to cut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities".

1 Jackson State Forest is one of the only protected redwood forest areas west of highway 101 in Mendocino County. Much if not most of the redwood forest in that zone of the county is currently directly or indirectly affected by logging. I am deeply disturbed that given the scarcity of protected redwood forest land in the area, logging continues to take place within the State Forest. I have spent quite a bit of time inside this particular forest, and I can tell you that even the State Forest land that is NOT being currently (or 2 recently) cut is feeling massive negative effects secondary to logging. There are an 3,4 excessive amount of active roads within the park, there is major hillside erosion, and 5 there are immense populations of invasive plant species such as Scotch Broom wherever the logging activity has taken place. The primary activity that should be taking place right 6 now is restoration of this repeatedly abused piece of land, not continued destruction.

7 I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any timber harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group. To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

FL 9

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Casey Cadile
1448 Topar Ave
Los Altos, CA 94024

Email Letter EC-123

An identical letter was received by mail (GMF-24). The following serves to respond to both letters.

See Response to Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
The majority of public wildlands in the North Coast region of California are set aside as reserves and parks to preserve rare ecosystems and wild areas. Demonstration State Forests, by contrast, are public lands that by legislative mandate have a unique and distinctly different purpose from parks and wilderness areas. State Forests are mandated to conduct research, demonstration, and education on sustainable forestry practices using active forest management, including periodic timber harvests. See General Response 2 and 16.

Response to Comment 2
The Board recognizes that past logging operations, especially those prior to designation of the property as a state forest and the implementation of the Forest Practice Act, have resulted in significant environmental impacts. The Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan (ADFFMP) represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources when compared to previous management plans. One of the primary goals of the JDSF Management Plan is to achieve net improvements of conditions for all natural resources over time in comparison to existing conditions. While the first goal under the ADFFMP is Research and Demonstration, the second goal is Forest Restoration and the third goal is Watershed and Ecosystem Processes (see Appendix I in the RDEIR). See also General Response 15.

Response to Comment 3
JDSF is not a park. See General Response 13.

Response to Comment 4
A detailed discussion of landslides and erosion, including management goals, proposed management actions, potential impacts, and mitigation measures, can be found in DEIR, Section VII.7. As part of the management plan special concern areas were identified, including those areas at high risk of slope failure. Implementation of a Road Management Plan (see General Response 13) and Hillslope Management to provide for slope stability, including input from a Certified Engineering Geologist, will be utilized to reduce the risk of management related adverse impacts associated with landslides and surface erosion.

Additional protection measures relating to mass wasting, surface erosion, road management, and riparian vegetation can be found in Chapter 3 of the DFMP or ADFFMP, and also are discussed in various sections of the DEIR (VII.6.6 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat, VII.7 Geology and Soils, VII.10 Hydrology and Water Quality, and VIII Cumulative Effects) and RDEIR.

Adoption of the ADFFMP, with regard to timber harvesting, is not expected to result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

Response to Comment 5
The Board recognizes the problem of invasive plant species regionally and on JDSF. The Board further recognizes the potential for disturbance, including timber harvest operations, to exacerbate this problem. JDSF will utilize integrated weed management (IWM), including monitoring and adaptive management, as an approach to controlling invasive weed species (see DEIR, Section VII.6.2 and ADFFMP Chapter 3, Invasive Weed Species, for further information regarding management of invasive species).

Response to Comment 6
See General Response 15.

Response to Comment 7

Timber harvesting, including the allocation of various silvicultural prescriptions, under the ADFFMP is based on providing a varied landscape with a set of forest structures designed to support a diverse research and demonstration program. See also General Response 2, 10, 15, and 16.

EC133

From: stevenchr@yahoo.com
Posted At: Wednesday, June 27, 2007 11:34 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

FL 9 I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group. I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the working group into Alternative G.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

1 If you need an example of state forests that do not allow logging; Illinois banned logging on state public lands in the early nineties. The tourism dollars are a greater benefit than the small amount of revenue timber receipts generate for a select few logging companies.

FL 9 We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Steve Christianson
230 Selby Ranch Rd. #1
Sacramento, CA 95864

Email Letter EC- 133

See Response to Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
The value of JDSF as a research and demonstration forest goes well beyond that of revenue generated from timber receipts. See General Response 2.

EC136

From: gioia@sonic.net
Posted At: Wednesday, June 27, 2007 3:03 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

FL 9 I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group. I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the working group into Alternative G.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

I've been fighting this battle for the last 30 years.
I've tried every way possible to impress on those in charge how precious this forest is to our family and every person we?ve ever met in the forest. Everyone would say, ?This is special, don?t tell anyone it?s here. Keep it secret so they won?t spoil it.?

1 My husband and I fell in love in the peace of these redwoods and later returned to get married.
All of our fondest memories are there.

However, we have witnessed the careless atrocities your poor management practices have caused.
We?ve seen it all. We?ve seen acres of clear cutting, that no one was watching, and all they could tell us was this isn?t what the logging company agreed to, but no one stopped them or punished them for what they did. We?ve been camping on weekends when logs were scalped and carried out by helicopter from sun up til sun down. It was like being in a war zone and that?s just what it was. Logging companies attacking the forest for profit.

E-136 cont.

All you see are dollar signs that are wasted as soon as you get them - this forest can not be replaced. Protect it at all cost.

1 I?ve had to give up the last 5 years that I would have been healthy enough to camp, because by stopping you from logging, you?ve stopped me from getting to camp 8 (the home of my soul).
I can?t tell you how much pain this has cost my heart, but anything is worth it if we can protect this forest.

Sincerely,
Gioia Davis
16315 Watson Road
Guerneville, CA 95446

Email Letter EC-136

See Response to Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
See Response to Comment Email Letter C2-173. Areas of the Forest have been closed to camping at various times, primarily due to wet conditions, access or maintenance difficulties, the availability of maintenance and security personnel, or the presence of threatened or endangered species. There is a known northern spotted owl activity center in the vicinity of Road 361 along the North Fork of the South Fork of the Noyo River. Camping is restricted seasonally near the site when it is occupied by owls.

Generally, forest roads with unimproved surfaces are closed to vehicular traffic during the wet weather season to prevent unnecessary damage to the road surfaces and to prevent erosion and siltation.

EC 140

Gipson, Lisa

From: beatrootalan@netscape.net
Posted At: Thursday, June 28, 2007 9:26 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

FL 9 I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

1 However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them. A well-known aphorism says 'you don't know what you've got till it's gone'. We've all seen the depletion of treasured natural environments due to human influence and abuse. We must do all we can to avoid continuing this trend, and to reverse it. Conservation and restoration must be the priorities.

FL 9 I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group. I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the working group into Alternative G.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Alan Cook
6942 Santa Rita Ave.
Garden Grove, CA 92845

Email Letter EC-140

See Response to Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 15.

EC144

Gipson, Lisa

	ssmofa@cwnet.com
Posted At:	Thursday, June 28, 2007 11:15 AM
Conversation:	Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To:	Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment
Subject:	Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

FL 9 I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them. 1 Forests have many aspects we still do not understand. The canopy holds many secrets and once these forests are gone, they cannot be recreated.

I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group. I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the working group into Alternative G. This group has done a great deal of work on behalf of our grandchildren and preserving the great resource which we have mostly lost. A small forest area is still a reservoir for preservation.

2 I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan. This is the only solution which will work for everyone, including those not yet born and for the non-humans affected by our forest-use decisions.

FL 9 To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward. These decisions are always difficult and involve much give and take. We appreciate the work done so far.

Sincerely,
Sandra Morey
3461 Laguna Ave
Oakland, CA 94602

1

Email Letter EC-144

See Response to Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
The Board concurs that "forests have many aspects we still do not understand". JDSF will remain a redwood forest and retain its designation as a research and demonstration forest. The current management direction is based on creating a broad range of stand conditions to support a diverse research program, including issues related to the ecology of the forest canopy.

Response to Comment 2
See General Response 15 and 18.

EC-147

From: omni@mcn.org
Posted At: Tuesday, July 03, 2007 1:46 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G Comments
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G Comments

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

FL 9

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

1

It is of worthy note that areas close to and abutting JSDF have been purchased privately and committed to sustainable forestry.
This is a trend that promises to continue throughout Redwood country and offers a truly sustainable mission fully compliant with the intent and spirit of the 1976 Forest Practice Act.
Those lands have been permanenly deeded/committed to zero clearcuts unless the forerst is endangered by some unforseen menace. This change in use is a strong statement, or rather mandate, for CDF to practice modern forestry that truly respects the nature of California forests.

FL 9

With this and my long experience in natural systems I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group. I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the working group into Alternative G.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are near the end of the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my personal and community thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
BC Macdonald
POB69
Albion, CA 95410

Email Letter EC-147

See Response to Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
The Board is aware of the management direction of neighboring properties. The Board and CAL FIRE are also committed to sustainable management practices on JDSF. Unlike the neighboring properties JDSF has a mandate as a research and demonstration forest. The Board and the Department are responsible for developing a management plan for JDSF that is consistent with existing legislation and supports the research and demonstration mandate of the state forest system. Timber harvesting, including the allocation of various silvicultural prescriptions, under the ADFFMP is based on providing a varied landscape with a set of forest structures designed to support a diverse research and demonstration program. See also General Response 2, 10, and 15.

EC154

From: dwillis@mcn.org
Posted At: Sunday, July 15, 2007 10:34 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 Using clearcuts as "scientific research" reminds me of the justification for Japanese whaling, in which they are allowed to take a certain number of whales each year for "scientific research." Certainly there are enough clearcut areas in the Pacific West, not to mention northern California, to provide scientists with endess research opportunities for the foreseeable future.

2 It also seems clear to me that the future of Jackson state forest will involve more recreational uses in the near future, as our logging economy turns more and more to a tourist economy.

3 Jackson should not be used as a cash cow under the guise of research.

Having said that, I recognize that Alternative G has some positive aspects, especially in working with the public.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

FL 9 To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
donald willis
PO Box 1176
Willits, CA 95490

Email Letter EC-154

See Response to Comment Form Letter 9.

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 2
See General Response 14.

Response to Comment 3
The Forest will not be used as a "cash cow". The growth and utilization of timber will remain sustainable, and harvest will remain well below the level of annual growth during the term of the management plan.

EC159

Gipson, Lisa

From: IWS@sonic.net
Posted At: Monday, July 16, 2007 9:01 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 Clear cutting is an abomination driven by an combination of greed and ignorance, that completely lacks any sort of understanding of mycology and the association that exists between fungi, soils, water distribution cycles and the diverse plant community that supports a healthy forest. Without such an understanding we are left with simplistic 2 models of disease and are shocked and suprised by things like sudden oak death, and we are 3 and left with a legacy of costs ranging from soil loss and loss of productivity, damaged 4,5,6 fisheries and fire suppression without end. We are killing both important species and other species that are currently and ignorantly not deemed to be unimportant with this 7 neolithic approach. We also miss the opportunities to enhance carbon sequestration by failing to maximize sustained growth.

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

However, I strongly oppose giving the forest managers an open-ended license to clearcut thousands of acres each decade to provide for unspecified "future research possibilities." We need more research on restoring forests, not on destroying them.

FL 9 I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working group. I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the working group into Alternative G.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Bob Rawson
PO Box 157
Sebastopol, CA 95473

1

Email Letter EC-159

Response to Comment 1
The DEIR/RDEIR has analyzed the effects of the proposed limited clearcutting. This analysis included the items listed by the commenter. The DEIR recognizes the role of mycorrhizal fungi. Clearcutting remains a frequently used technique in the redwood region. The limited clearcutting allowed in Alternative G would allow for possible research to determine which organisms and processes are at risk from this management practice and examine protection measures. This could provide benefits well beyond the boundaries of JDSF. See also General Response 10.

Response to Comment 2
Research into sudden oak death is ongoing at several state forests, including JDSF.

Response to Comment 3
See EC-123 Response to Comment 4.

Response to Comment 4
See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 5
No significant environmental impacts associated with wildland fires are expected as a result of implementing the ADFFMP. See DEIR section VII.8 and RDEIR section III.8

Response to Comment 6
No specific information is provided with regard to the concern that implementation of the ADFFMP will result in “killing both important species and other species”. A reasoned response is not possible. Adoption of the ADFFMP, with regard to clearcutting and even-age management, is not expected to result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

Response to Comment 7
Refer to EC-42, Response to Comment 2 and E-116 (2005 DEIR) response.

EC160

From: Donald Nierlich [cct@coastwalk.org]
Posted At: Monday, July 16, 2007 9:51 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest

1 Although I live in Southern California, I have followed the discussion of timber cutting policy for Jackson State Forest with interest. This is because I have traveled widely, both in the State, the U.S. and internationally, and wherever I have seen clear cutting, I am appalled at the ecological consequences--the loss of habitat, the extensive destruction of the (above and below) ground flora and fauna, and the long -term horizon for regrowth. I can only support Alternative G with the proviso that clear cutting be strictly limited to approved forestry research.

Donald Nierlich
[Professor Emeritus, Microbiology]
[Coastwalk volunteer]
Santa Monica

Email Letter EC-160

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 10.

EC163

From: jbart@mcn.org
Posted At: Monday, July 16, 2007 11:07 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Alternative G
Posted To: Jackson State Demonstration Forest Public Comment

Subject: Jackson State Forest Alternative G

Members Board of Forestry
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 I live just down the road from Jackson State Forest. I cannot believe that clear cuts are being considered in the plans as per Alternative G. Why would we destroy our last
2 remaining forests in this way? With the evidence of global warming it is an even more frightening proposition.

I congratulate the Board on its actions to ensure that Jackson State Forest is managed for the broad public interest. I support Alternative G's emphasis on research, forest restoration and ecological health, and recreation and public enjoyment.

I cannot support Alternative G in its present form. Any clearcut or similar destructive harvest needs to have an explicit research justification and be limited to the minimum area required for scientific validity, as recommended by the Mendocino County working
FL 9 group. I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the working group into Alternative G.

I applaud the interim period in Alternative G during which forest managers will work with a new public advisory committee to develop a long-range landscape and management plan.

To ensure success of the interim planning effort, all proposed interim timber harvests need to be reviewed by the Jackson Advisory Committee. This review is needed to assure that interim harvests are designed and chosen so as to keep open planning options for restoration, habitat, and recreation to the maximum extent feasible.

We are close to ending the long controversy that has kept our public forest shut down for eight years. Please make the requested changes in Alternative G. You will have my thanks and support for moving us forward.

Sincerely,
Joselyn Bartlett
44002 Fern Creek Rd.
Caspar, CA 95420

Email Letter EC-163

Response to Comment 1
See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 2
Refer to EC-42, Response to Comment 2 and E-116 (2005 DEIR) response.

o:Board Members Forestry and Fire Protection FR (19166530989) 14:28 07/02/07GMT-5:00 Pg 01-01

EC-184

Dear Members of the Board:

Thank you for reorienting the management at Jackson Demonstration State Forest toward scientific research about a broad range of forest ecosystem issues.

FL 10 The idea of an Older Forest Structure Zone (OFSZ) is a good one, but the boundaries should be revised and expanded. The OFSZ fails to include many areas that currently have large, old trees, for instance near West Chamberlain Creek and Brandon Gulch. The region is so deficient in older trees, their location on Jackson should be the most important factor in designing the OFSZ. The Late Seral Development Areas within the OFSZ should also be expanded to ensure that significant intact areas of existing older forest remain for research and as reference stands. This is critical.

1 The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has changed the listing of Coho salmon from threatened to endangered, thus assisting the recovery of the species must be a top mandate. Habitat and road crossing are critical issues for the species.

2 I think a comprehensive recreation plan that identifies key assets, locations and reasonable public access is key to increasing public support for your efforts in the Jackson Forest.

Thank you for taking Jackson Forest in a new healthier direction as a complex of ecosystems. Thank you for listening. Thank you for acting.

D Cooke
67 Rosewell Court
San Jose, CA 95138

Email Letter EC-184

See Response to Comment Form Letter 10.

Response to Comment 1
State agencies, including CAL FIRE, are directed through a variety of programs and policies to protect and manage California's aquatic resources. These include, but aren't limited to:

- California Forest Practice Rules
- Basin Plan (see Section VII.7, Geology and Soils, and Section VII.10, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Fish and Game Code
- State and Federal Endangered Species Acts (see DEIR Section VII.6.1 regarding state and federal listings of salmonids)
- Clean Water Act (see Section VII.7, Geology and Soils, and Section VII.10, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Draft Jackson Demonstration State Forest Management Plan (DFMP/ADFFMP)

Management policies on JDSF will integrate and comply with these regulatory programs. The ADFFMP has been developed to achieve desired future conditions that will provide site- and species-specific protection measures that contribute to maintenance or improvement of the long-term conservation of population viability of aquatic and riparian dependent species of concern and enhance habitat values over existing conditions. See also General Response 11, 12 and 13.

Response to Comment 2
See General Response 14.