

IV.3 Responses to Individual DEIR E-Mail Comments E-41 to E-113

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.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-41

From: richard@rinc.com
Posted At: Tuesday, February 28, 2006 5:25 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

Common, people. For once, do the right thing. Save this forest for research, habitat and recreation. It's our forest. Don't turn it over to profiteers.

Sincerely,

Richard Childs
Box 888
Albion, California 95410
cc:
Senator Wesley Chesbro
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
Assembly Member Patty Berg
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-41

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2, 11, 12 and 14. The JDSF management plan will continue to provide for research, habitat protection, and recreation. There are no plans to “turn it over to profiteers”.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-43

From: MandrO@SacCounty.net
Posted At: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 2:34 PM
Conversation: Support draft EIR Alternative F
Subject: Support draft EIR Alternative F

Dear Members of the Board:

1 Jackson State Forest is an important public resource belonging to all Californians. I am very concerned that Jackson Forest has not been managed in a way that adequately balances the needs of fish and wildlife and the desires of most Californians with the Department's desire to log the forest.

2 Many times I had driven by Jackson State Forest, but because I knew nothing about it, I never stopped. One day, my husband and I decided to finally stop and take a hike through the Forest. We brought our picnic lunch and proceeded along what I now know was a logging road. We were looking forward to exploring the Forest and experiencing a "typical" forest, alive with animals and health.

3 You probably know where this story is going. When we came upon the clearcutting, the trashed landscape, and the deadness, I was so upset that we immediately hiked back to the car with our uneaten lunches.

I strongly urge you to adopt Alternative F, the "Older Forest Emphasis" plan for management at Jackson.

Sincerely,

Olga Mandrussow
2627 U Street, Apt. 9
Sacramento, CA 95818-1837

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-43

Response to Comment 1

See Response to Form Letter 6.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 2, 10 and 14. A detailed discussion of Aesthetic Resources, including impacts, thresholds of significance, and mitigation measures can be found in section VII.2 and VIII.9 of the DEIR. Additional analysis of aesthetics, as related to recreation, can be found in section VII.14. Further analysis of potential impacts to aesthetic resources relating to Alternative G and the ADFMP can be found in RDEIR section III.2 and III.14. The Board recognizes that timber operations can lead to negative impacts on the aesthetics of an area, however determining specific “thresholds of significance” is highly personal and subjective (see General Response 6). The DEIR/RDEIR analysis of these potential impacts found that application of several mitigation measures would reduce the potential negative impacts to less than significant.

Response to Comment 3

Support for Alternative F noted.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-44

From: coolside@aol.com
Posted At: Wednesday, February 15, 2006 9:29 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I am particularly concerned about the draft environmental document (Draft EIR) and the proposed management plan for Jackson State Forest. Proposals are inadequate for the protection of the public's interest, especially with regards to salmon and the protection of salmon streams. I am also concerned that public use will be curtailed (or made unpleasant) as public managed properties are turned over for the old-style damage of clearcut logging. There are modern forestry practices for logging that must be insisted on, regulated, and enforced. The total public use of the land must be considered, including recreation.

The draft EIR is too large and expensive for most individuals to personally review; so we must hold you, as a public official, personally responsible for making decisions that take recreational and educational use of the forest as seriously as the claims of logging. We must hold you responsible for seeing that logging is done without destroying or seriously damaging the other uses of the forest.

Sincerely,

Christine Hartzell
909 Portage Ave
Three Rivers, Michigan 49091

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-44

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 3

See General Response 14.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 5.

Response to Comment 5

See General Response 2 and 15. The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products. The ADFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources. 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.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-45

From: broupome@kona.net
Posted At: Wednesday, March 01, 2006 1:49 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

- 1 I am a Californian by birth and by heart (born in Long Beach, raised in Altadena) and it truly saddens me to see the State letting an opportunity to protect and enhance one of its precious redwood forests slip through its fingers.
- 2 The population, and the demand for quality recreational opportunities, are greatly expanding. Along with the Golden Gate Bridge, the redwoods are a symbol of California and a tourism draw.
- 3 There is unquestionably greater public benefit - and I believe greater economic future - in preservation and restoration than in clearcutting and other consumptive practices. Yet this choice is not even being seriously considered.
- 4
- 5 Significant logging activities probably cannot, and certainly will not, be accomplished, without significant environmental damage. Please take a longer-range view and rewrite your management plan to protect the Jackson State Forest for all people for all time.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Pomeroy
59-148 Olomana Rd.
Kamuela, Hawaii 96743

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-45

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 14.

Response to Comment 3

See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 4.

Response to Comment 5

See General Response 6 and 15. Support for a preservation oriented management plan noted. Implementation of the ADFMP is not expected to cause significant adverse environmental impacts. The ADFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources. 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.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Kraemer, Candace

E-46

From: Stacey Smith [Stacey22@adelphia.net]
Posted At: Friday, February 24, 2006 11:32 AM
Conversation: Jackson State
Subject: Jackson State

To, Whom it may concern.

1 I am writing to express my great concern regarding Jackson State Demonstration Forest. This Forest has had an active management plan in effect and working until current legal issues. Up until these current legal issues, the forest was actively managed. Reducing the fire hazard, eliminating any disease ridden trees to help to keep the forest healthy, and planting and restoring for future. As well as managing the forest, they maintained the roadways, keeping them open and useable to the public, and the water ways.

While the forest is being held up by legal issues it is being neglected, which is allowing any problems caused by mother nature to spread, and worsen. Not only is mother nature causing erosion, diseases to spread, making an unhealthy forest, we also have inconsiderate people dumping trash, and causing problems to the roads, waterways, and everything else.

When the forest is aloud to be actively managed, most of the concerns are taken care of. The roads are maintained, the waterways are keep open, and it is closely watched not allowing our forest to turn into a "dump." Along with the maintance to ensure a healthy forest for our future, the State is also collecting revenue, to help with the state parks.

2 I fill that our forest have been carefully maintained, allowing new growth to become healthy, and letting mother nature take it's course. Look at the other once mangaged forests that have now became State Parks. They are not maintained. The road ways are washing away, and unuseable. The waterways are full of down trees, and not flowing naturally. Diseases are spreading to healthy trees. The sun light is inaduate for healthy growth. No one is planting new trees, to unsure for their future. We are not able to access once useable property for recreational preposes. The fire hazard is greatly induced. How is a major fire going to be stopped? The roads are not 100% useable. The down timber, dry brush is just a big match waiting to be lit.

This scares me, what is going to happen to all of our forests? Are we going to allow selfish people to keep putting legal suits on the State, bringing us deeper in debt, stopping our forests to be managed and allow it to grow unhealthy?

Please allow our forest to be maintained, to be accessable to the public, to stop diseases from spreading, to help reducess the fire hazards, to help give our State some more funding.

Please stop this legal battle, and start helping to insure the future of our forest.

Stacey Anderson
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
stacey22@adelphia.net

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-46

Response to Comment 1

The Board agrees that it would be highly beneficial for the State Forest to fully resume management activities, so the Board is working actively to certify the EIR and approve a management plan. The ADFMP contains provisions to address forest health, road management, and aquatic resources.

The Board recognizes the fact that the loss of revenue in recent years has precluded some management activities. In particular, an absence of significant revenue has reduced the level of road maintenance and improvement, as well as other aspects of forest management, such as timber stand improvement, stream restoration, research, and recreation. However, some level of management associated with these activities has occurred.

The Board believes that active management includes strong forest security, which will improve the level of environmental protection, and will reduce the impacts upon aesthetics caused by illegal dumping.

Response to Comment 2

Support for the past management noted (see General Response 2). JDSF will not be converted into a park. The management plan will continue the tradition of a working forest landscape that serves to demonstrate viable and sustainable forest management. Proposed management activities relating to botanical resources, timber resources, and protection from the spread of diseases can be found in the DEIR sections VII.6.2, VII.6.3, and VII.6.4 respectively. Proposed management activities relating to fire prevention and protection measures can be found in section VII.8. The Board supports a balanced, multiple-use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products while allowing continued public access for recreation.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-47

From: CBecker43@aol.com
Posted At: Wednesday, March 01, 2006 9:49 AM
Conversation: Jackson Plan
Subject: Jackson Plan

I finally got through with the choices on the two plans. I wanted to express my choice for choosing PLAN D.

Briefly, I think plan D combines the best elements possible at this point in time. AND thank you so for giving all of us more time to wade through everything related to the Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report. Carol Becker, Fort Bragg.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-47

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative D noted.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-48

From: seavey@biostat.wisc.edu
Posted At: Thursday, February 09, 2006 11:38 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I strongly oppose the clear-cutting of the Jackson State Forest.
Who would benefit? The forest belongs to the public. I have enjoyed camping in this forest,
and have, of course, brought revenue to the state on trips to this forest

Sincerely,

Beverly Seavey
301 N Midvale Blvd #3
Madison, Wisconsin 53705

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-48

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2, 10, and 14.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-49

From: patotzka@pacbell.net
Posted At: Monday, February 13, 2006 9:18 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

Every week, I am bombarded with email alerts of how our 'society' is attacking this forest, or that arctic region. When will our govt and other buracracies stop thinking only of the all mighty dollar and start planning on preserving what's left on this planet as Nature intended it to be?

This goes for Jackson State Forest in Northern California.
Please just leave it alone--the land belongs to the People--NOT the corporations whose only interest is a lesson in short-sighted destruction for profit.

Sincerely,

Lori Patotzka
2066 Camel Lane #24
Walnut Creek, California 94596
cc:
Senator Tom Torlakson
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
Assembly Member Guy Houston
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-49

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2, 15, 16, and 17. Support for a preservation oriented management plan noted.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-51

From: spelman@u.washington.edu
Posted At: Monday, February 13, 2006 10:33 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 We travel for hundreds of miles to enjoy the Jackson Forest.
It's recreational use of just about the best state forest I know. Please don't take that away. I oppose the new (proposed) management plan for the Jackson Forest. Most of the alternatives offered by the plan seem to emphasize commercial logging at the expense of more sustainable recreation.

2 The draft environmental document's Alternative E seems closest to my view in that it promotes restoration of old growth, but it is ruled out as contrary to Board of Forestry policy. (?!?) That seems backwards to me.

3 The draft EIS concludes that the state's proposed heavy logging plan (Alternative C) can be carried out with "less than significant environmental impacts." On the face of it, that seems absurd, but I'll admit that the EIS is so huge that I was unable to review it thoroughly. I'd say that right there you were contrary to Board of Forestry policy, which is supposed to give concerned citizens the ability to review and understand the proposed plans of action.

5 Is it really Board of Forestry policy to favor industry in such a lopsided manner over other forest users (and the long-term health of local communities)?

Sincerely,

Peter Michaelsen
720 34th Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98122

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-51

See Response to Form Letter 2.

Response to Comment 1

Opposition to the DFMP noted. See General Response 2, 4 and 14.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 8, 9, and 4.

Response to Comment 3

See General Response 6.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 3, 4, and 5.

Response to Comment 5

The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products. See also General Response 16 and 17.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-52

From: kbrun@mcn.org
Posted At: Tuesday, February 14, 2006 11:24 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

Dear Board of Forestry, I am a neighbor of Jackson State Forest in Mendocino. I hike in the forest (especially Forest History Trail area) on a regular basis. I have not had time to review the EIR. However, I do want to let you know that I support the regeneration of old growth, restoration of habitat, and recreational opportunities. Our public forest should not primarily support logging interests or be seen in purely economic terms. Even if this were so, Mendocino's economy is becoming more dependent on tourism, and cutting down the older stands will not help our community's development. Please keep in mind the people who live in this area and who appreciate the forest. Also keep in mind that Jackson is the largest publicly owned redwood forest in the country, something special to take care of and preserve for future generations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Katherine Brun P.O. Box 1102 Mendocino CA 95460

Sincerely,

Katie & Aaron Brun
PO Box 1102
Mendocino, California 95460
cc:
Senator Wesley Chesbro
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
Assembly Member Patty Berg
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-52

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 15.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-53

From: Information and Referral [ir@mountaincommunityresources.org]
Posted At: Tuesday, February 21, 2006 3:55 PM
Conversation: Jackson Demonstration Forest
Subject: Jackson Demonstration Forest

Please revisit the EIR for the forest and make sure that more protections are put in place to protect the ecosystem.

Thank you!

Laurie Jacobs
Scotts Valley, CA

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-53

Response to Comment 1

The Board has developed a management plan that incorporates elements of several alternatives. Implementation of the ADFMP is not expected to cause significant adverse environmental impacts. The ADFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources. 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. See General Response 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-54

From: Charles Smith [cfsmith@napanet.net]
Posted At: Monday, February 06, 2006 11:20 PM
Conversation: Jackson Demonstration Forest
Subject: Jackson Demonstration Forest

Mr. George Gentry
Executive Officer
Board of Forestry

Dear Mr. Gentry,

Let's use our common sense and keep the Jackson Demonstration Forest
Forest going. It's a wonderful resource.

Please feel free to pass this along to anyone whom you feel should be
be informed.

You guys at the Board of Forestry do a very creditable and important
important job. Keep up the good work.

Regards,
Charles Smith
Smith-Madrone Winery
St. Helena, Ca

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-54

Response to Comment 1

The Board agrees that it would be highly beneficial for the State Forest to fully resume management activities, so the Board is working actively to certify the EIR and approve a management plan.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-55

Kraemer, Candace

From: Kevin Lozaw [klozaw@comcast.net]
Posted At: Thursday, February 09, 2006 9:44 PM
Conversation: Jackson Demonstration Forest
Subject: Jackson Demonstration Forest

February 9, 2006
George D. Gentry, Executive Officer
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460
Email: board.public.comments@fire.ca.gov

Dear Mr. Gentry:

FL5 { I would like to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Jackson Demonstration State Forest. I believe that alternative C-1, the proposed project, permits excessive logging and provides insufficient protection for old-growth forest, wildlife habitat, and watercourses.

I strongly request that you to revisit the environmental impact report for Jackson Demonstration State Forest, and develop an alternative that would more effectively safeguard and restore the natural forest ecosystem; fish and wildlife habitat; and water quality (including the end of herbicide use).

1 Importantly, the practice of clearcutting as a management tool should be eliminated and carry with it a heavy fine. This fine should both direct monetary compensation as well as reforestation of the clearcut land. Additionally, logging rights should be terminated on an area equal to four times the area that was clearcut (i.e. the clearcut plus "treble damages"). It must also be of equal quality. This prohibition should be permanent as well as binding on the entity's parent(s) and subsidiary(s) that exist now or in the future.

2 The natural wonder of our Old Growth Forests must be protected. We must allow them, at a minimum, to remain in tact, with no further harvesting of any kind and be protected by generous buffer zones to ensure their health.

FL5 { Finally, I respectfully request that the Board of Forestry extend the public comment period another 60 days. The size and complexity of a 1500-page EIR makes it impractical for the public to respond during the statutory 60 day period allowed for public comment.

11/13/2007

Thank you,

Kevin Lozaw
Lozaw Photography
San Anselmo, California
C: 415.260.9950
Fax: 415.459.4082
www.InnerVisionPhoto.com

Email Letter E-55

See Response to Form Letter 5

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2 and 10. The practice of clearcutting is not a violation of law as long as it complies with the applicable Forest Practices Rules.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 8 and 9.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-56

From: Nancy Schroeder [gracey ruth@sbcglobal.net]
Posted At: Monday, February 13, 2006 10:21 PM
Conversation: Jackson Demonstration State Forest
Subject: Jackson Demonstration State Forest

February 13, 2006

Dear Mr. Gentry,

1 I believe the Draft EIR for the Jackson Demonstration State Forest inadequately addresses the needs of the environment and favors the timber industry. There can be a solution that allows me to go to the hardware store and buy the lumber I need to fix my deck and that also protects the ecosystem of the forest.

2 Old growth trees are the most resistant to fire and disease, and they are also the most beautiful. They must be ardently protected from all logging. Water quality is consistently under attack, therefore clearcutting and herbicide use must be prohibited.

3 Fish and wildlife will also thank you for this approach.

4.5 Being that the DEIR is so extensive, please extend the public comment period.

6 Thank you for your attention.

Nancy Schroeder

5/22/2006

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-56

Response to Comment 1

The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products. See also General Response 2 and 17.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 8 and 9.

Response to Comment 3

See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 5

See General Response 7.

Response to Comment 6

See General Response 5.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-57

From: Peter Parker [ptparker@earthlink.net]
Posted At: Wednesday, March 01, 2006 10:04 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Draft Report
Subject: Jackson State Draft Report

Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
Sacramento, CA

March 1, 2006 at 2:00 P.M.

Dear Sirs:

1 I am a former member of Director Richard Wilson's Citizens Advisory Committee. After due
consideration of all of the Alternatives available I favor Alternative D (Citizens
Advisory Committee Proposal). After more than a year of meetings and deliberation our
committee favored uneven aged management and harvesting less than is grown in order to
2 maintain good forest habitat, esthetics and canopy cover in order to minimize adverse
watershed effects. The maintenance of a productive forest, able to supply the needs of an
ever expanding California population with a renewable building material are very important
considerations in my decision.

This plan will maintain a high lever of habitat protection while keeping this working
forest producing revenue for the State and valuable resources for it's citizens.

Sincerely,

Peter T. Parker
Former Member Citizens Advisory Committee

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-57

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative D noted. The ADFFMP incorporates several elements from Alternative D. See General Response 2

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 10, 11, and 12. See also E-24, Response to Comment 1, 2 and 5. The ADFFMP restricts the use of even-age management to 26 percent of the forest. Within that restricted area a mix of even and uneven-age management will occur. The timber harvest level under the ADFFMP is based on providing a varied landscape with a set of forest structures designed to support a viable research and demonstration program rather than a goal of a particular level of production. This analysis has resulted in a planned average annual harvest level of approximately 20 to 25 million board feet which is well below the current growth. In addition, the commitment to monitoring and adaptive management will ensure not only that harvest does not exceed growth, but that other timber related resource conditions are on the correct trajectory to meet the stated management goals. Potential impacts to other resource values (including wildlife habitat, aesthetics, and watershed processes) have been mitigated to "less than significant". Taken as a whole, the implementation of the ADFFMP is expected to have many beneficial impacts to the overall forest health of JDSF.

The Board recognizes that timber operations can lead to negative impacts on the aesthetics of an area, however determining specific "thresholds of significance" is highly personal and subjective (see General Response 6). The DEIR/RDEIR analysis of these potential impacts found that application of several mitigation measures would reduce the potential negative impacts to less than significant. A detailed discussion of Aesthetic Resources, including impacts, thresholds of significance, and mitigation measures can be found in section VII.2 and VIII-94 of the DEIR. Additional analysis of aesthetics, as related to recreation, can be found in section VII.14.

The management plan will include a high level of protection for aquatic habitat, and will provide for continued recovery of this valuable resource. Please see DEIR Section VII.6.1 for the assessment of potential impacts to aquatic species. See also General Response 11.

The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products. The ADFFMP has placed greater emphasis on protection and restoration, with the goal of improving all resource values over time in comparison to existing conditions. See also General Response 15.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-58

From: Nancy A. Smith [rnsmith@mindspring.com]
Posted At: Sunday, February 12, 2006 10:29 AM
Conversation: Jackson Forest
Subject: Jackson Forest

Dear Mr. Gentry,

Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Jackson Demonstration State Forest; as a native Californian and citizen whose family has enjoyed the California forests for generations, I, we (20 of us who are of voting age now) feel the Alternative C-1 proposed project allows for too much logging of our beautiful old growth forest, wildlife habitat and rivers and creeks. There needs to be more protection of these irreplaceable jewels of our heritage. We need an alternative that will protect wildlife habitat including fish by protecting the water quality, and preserve the old growth from harvest.

These trees cannot be replaced and are among the few areas left where we can experience our old growth forests as some of our ancestors saw them. Taking a new look at our state treasure here would mean eliminating clear-cutting to manage areas, and the use of herbicide.

Also we would like to request an extension of the comment period for at least a few months since the new, voluminous EIR requires serious study. I am sure this would be easy for you to accommodate, because you are not in the business of bamboozling the public with a last minute, large (1,500 pages) volume containing information they have no time to comment on let alone read and understand. This political tactic we have seen too much of on the federal level with the current administration and we do not want that corruption of process to pollute our California decision making processes; as I am sure you would agree. Sincerely,
Nancy A. Smith

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-58

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 8 and 15.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 12.

Response to Comment 3

See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 5

See General Response 7.

Response to Comment 6

See General Response 5.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-59

From: Dennis [manytrees@myway.com]
Posted At: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 7:31 PM
Conversation: Jackson DEIR
Subject: Jackson DEIR

Executive Officer
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

I am a professional forester and forest landowner and I have had the opportunity review the Jackson Demonstration State Forest DEIR. It is time to listen to professionals and accept this document. I find it very comprehensive, easily understood, and clearly evaluates the environmental issues. JDSF can be a viable resource for small and large forest landowners, by providing scientific analysis of forest management alternatives. The preferred alternative (Alternative C1) recognizes the need to balance the uses of JDSF and does not support any single use management program. Timber harvesting is one of the primary tools to not only conduct research in, but to help enhance the States environmental and timber resources. Without this tool there will be a decay of this viable resource along with a decline in the associated economical and social benefits.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this DEIR.

Sincerely,
Dennis Bebensee, RPF #368
7490 Shasta Forest Drive
Shingletown, CA 96088
530 474 4838
manytrees@myway.com

No banners. No pop-ups. No kidding.
Make My Way your home on the Web - <http://www.myway.com>

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-59

Response to Comment 1

The Board generally agrees with these comments. Support for Alternative C-1 noted. The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-60

From: forester@nature.berkeley.edu
Posted At: Monday, February 06, 2006 5:59 PM
Conversation: Draft EIS Public Comment
Subject: Draft EIS Public Comment

Dear George Gentry,
I would like to take a moment to comment on the new Draft EIS report for Jackson Demonstration State Forest. As a Mendocino High School graduate and a current researcher at UC Berkeley, I would like JDSF to stay a demonstration forest open for research. Forest research is extremely important to make certain the state's forests are healthy and productive while providing the state with continuous forest habitat, recreation, clean water, timber, and all kinds of forest products. CDF has managed JDSF since 1947 to achieve many different goals most importantly, I believe, research for new methods of sustainable forest management. Please keep California green and golden and provide opportunity for research in the future.

Thank you for your time,

Erica Meta Smith
M.F. Student
O'Hara Silviculture Lab
Dept. of Environmental Science Policy and Management
137 Mulford Hall # 3114
Berkeley, CA 94720-3114

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-60

Response to Comment 1

Nearly the entire land base of JDSF will remain available for research. See General Response 2.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-61

From: Jade Lai [meinmaz2@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Saturday, February 25, 2006 6:59 PM
Conversation: Comments on the Mission of the California State Forestry Board
Subject: Comments on the Mission of the California State Forestry Board

Feb 25, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

The citizens of California are urging you to be true to the mission of protecting California's State Forests from short sighted corporate objectives that will destroy precious habitat, contribute to the increased probability of natural disasters, and forever deprive the citizens of California of irreplaceable forest lands for all generations to come.

Surely, you must have family members who have experienced the spiritual healing that comes from being in the wilderness. If not, I strongly suggest that you go on a camping trip as soon as possible.

You may not make rash decisions based on what lobbyists can offer. Your children and grandchildren will thank you for taking a responsible stand. It is time that all good and responsible humans take a stand on many issues that affect the future of the planet.

Long live Earth and all the Creatures. Respect what God so lovingly provided.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Jade Lai
58 BCarmelita Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-61

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2, 11, 12, and 15. The ADFFMP remains consistent with enabling legislation and Board policy. It is based on thoughtful, careful analysis and planning by professionals in their field. The ADFFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources. 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 ADFFMP represents a reasonable balance between production, protection, restoration, and recreation. Implementation of the ADFFMP is not expected to cause significant adverse environmental impacts.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-62

From: David Studebaker [dhstudebaker@earthlink.net]
Posted At: Saturday, February 11, 2006 12:30 PM
Conversation: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan
Subject: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan

Feb 11, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

To: Calif State Forestry Board,
It's my understanding you are considering a plan for the management of the Jackson
Demonstration Forest that would effectively enhance the wildlife and the redwood trees
within its borders. I urgently implore you to accept and fully implement that plan so that
this forest can continue to serve the quality of life for all Californians that we prize
so highly. We're looking to you for enlightened and intelligent leadership in this matter.
With fervent hope,

David Studebaker
518 Almer Road, #4
Burlingame, CA. 94010

Sincerely,

David Studebaker
518 Almer Rd Apt 4
Burlingame, CA 94010-3900

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-62

Response to Comment 1

The ADFFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources. 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 plan is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-63

From: Alyssa Gobby [shinysheepie@aol.com]
Posted At: Saturday, February 25, 2006 5:54 PM
Conversation: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan
Subject: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan

Feb 25, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

The Red Woods should not be destroyed it should strive for futrue generations

Sincerely,

Alyssa Gobby
213 Koch Ave
Placentia, CA 92870-1927

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-63

Response to Comment 1

JDSF will remain a redwood forest. 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. See General Response 2 and 15.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-64

From: Mary Matzek [mgmatzek@sbcglobal.net]
Posted At: Friday, February 10, 2006 5:29 PM
Conversation: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan
Subject: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan

Feb 10, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

1 I stand in awe of the only "CANOPY" forests we have left in North America. I'm pensive and renewed when I visit these places of solitude; and I'm respectful. I am not allowed to remove a twig or a cone from a state or national forest or park and I don't. I understand that millions or even thousands of people visit and if each person took a cone, we would change our communal property and insure its destruction. Why then would our State Forestry Board even think that it is okay with WE THE PEOPLE to change things and put Jackson State Demonstration Forest at risk?????

2 I'm old enough to remember the stands of dead Chestnut trees on the East Coast that was the other North American canopy tree that is now gone, an ecological disaster of major proportions. It is imperative that we save what little we have left before we reach the point of no return. Mass deaths of fish, frogs, wildlife. We may be destroying our own habitat, our weather, by destroying our earths cover. I strongly urge you to wait for the science before allowing anything that destroys or harms our State Forest. Please adopt ALTERNATIVE F, the "Older Forest Emphasis" plan for management at Jackson Demonstration State Forest.

Sincerely,

Mary Matzek
1579 Pennsylvania Gulch Rd
Murphys, CA 95247-9553

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-64

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2 and 15. JDSF's management direction derives directly from legislative statutes, regulations, and policies set by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. Per Board policy, the primary purpose of JDSF is to conduct innovative demonstrations, experiments, and education in forest management (Board of Forestry Policy 0351.2). The legislation that provided for establishment of JDSF makes it very clear that demonstration of maximum sustained timber production is one of the primary purposes of forest management on JDSF. Rather than putting the forest "at risk", the ADFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources, while remaining consistent with enabling legislation. Implementation of the ADFMP is not expected to cause significant adverse environmental impacts.

Since its inception, JDSF has been managed as a research and demonstration forest. JDSF serves as a unique resource for developing the science that will guide the development of improved management practices and future forest practice rules. To support the research and demonstration mandate there has been an effort to maintain a viable outdoor laboratory by managing the forest to create diverse stand and habitat types. This diversity is needed to assess the effects of a broad range of management activities. Requests to manage JDSF for a single purpose, such as development of late seral and old growth stand conditions, while important, will severely limit the research and demonstration potential of the forest. The diverse habitats created by a broad spectrum of management practices has allowed for flexibility and opportunity for research as the issues and concerns involved in forest management have evolved over the past 60 years.

Response to Comment 2

Support for Alternative F noted. See General Response 4.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-66

From: Eleanor Antin [eantin@ucsd.edu]
Posted At: Friday, February 10, 2006 9:09 PM
Conversation: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan
Subject: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan

Feb 10, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

More attacks on the remaining fraction of our natural reserve? And again just to chop down trees to make more back yard furniture? its disgusting. Don't destroy more of California. The Jackson State Demonstration Forest has been protected for years. Why would any member of the state administration even consider changing what has been a stable plan for so long, unless there is some nefarious reason that we don't yet know. There can be no logical reason, there can only be a suspicious one. And attacking redwoods when there are so few left, is downright criminal. I'm not normally rude but there are a lot of us devastated by the paving over of California and the stealing away of our natural lands. We'll protest this one long and hard.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Antin
4016 Arroyo Sorrento Rd
San Diego, CA 92130-2611

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-66

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2. JDSF is a demonstration forest, not a reserve or park. It has been actively managed for the past 60 years to demonstrate maximum sustained production of high quality timber products. It remains "protected" from land use conversion to other purposes, including making it a park or reserve. The ADFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources, while remaining consistent with enabling legislation. This includes accelerated implementation of the Road Management Plan, a reduction in the use of even-age management and clearcutting, a reduction in the planned timber harvest level, an increase in the area dedicated to development of older forest and late-seral forest conditions, an increase in resource protection and restoration measures, such as snag retention and LWD placement, and a management emphasis on research, demonstration and education. Implementation of the ADFMP is not expected to cause significant adverse environmental impacts.

Please see also General Responses 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 15.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-67

From: Jon Krueger [jpk@rawbw.com]
Posted At: Friday, February 10, 2006 10:14 PM
Conversation: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan
Subject: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan

Feb 11, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

Please adopt Alternative F, the "Older Forest Emphasis"
plan.

Why?

Because F is the best balance between nature and the timber industry.

Becase F protects fish and wildlife.

And because Jackson Demonstration State Forest isn't replaceable. We can't just
manufacture another coastal redwood forest.

I urge you to adopt Alternative F. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Jon Krueger
4631 Gatetree Cir
Pleasanton, CA 94566-6033

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-67

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative F noted. The Board has found that some elements of Alternative F may not comply with legislation and policy related to state forest management (see DEIR Table VI.1). The ADFMP has been developed by blending the elements and management strategies of several Alternatives, including Alternative F. This includes accelerated implementation of the Road Management Plan, a reduction in the use of even-age management and clearcutting, a reduction in the planned timber harvest level, an increase in the area dedicated to development of older forest and late-seral forest conditions, an increase in resource protection and restoration measures, such as snag retention and LWD placement, and a management emphasis on research, demonstration and education.

Please see General Responses 2, 4, 11, 12, and 15.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-68

From: Christian Hellwig [cphellwig@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Sunday, February 19, 2006 10:57 AM
Conversation: Jacson SDF EIR
Subject: Jacson SDF EIR

Greetings,

1 { Because this forest contains significant stands capable of supporting old-growth dependent habitat, because these stands and adjacent forest land may support federally and/or state listed species, and because any forest harvesting conducted on this land may contribute to erosion and reduction in water quality in streams and moreover may reduce habitat values of bordering riparian areas, this forest should be minimally managed henceforth. No further timber harvesting of any kind should be conducted in this forest, and the natural fire cycle should be allowed to resume.

2 { Thanks and regards,
Christian Hellwig
310 Hillside Ave
Mill Valley CA 94941

Relax. Yahoo! Mail [virus scanning](#) helps detect nasty viruses!

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-68

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 15. Desire to end all harvesting noted (see General Response 16). The legislative mandate that created JDSF and guides its management is very clear that demonstration of sustainable and economic forest management is one of the primary purposes of JDSF. By providing research opportunities and demonstrating responsible and innovative forest management techniques JDSF influences management practices well beyond its boundaries.

Response to Comment 2

The ADFMP calls for the use of prescribed fire as resources allow (see Section VII.8.1 for a detailed discussion of fire related issues). Fire is recognized as a natural ecosystem process, however long-standing fire suppression policies have altered the fuel loading and forest structure characteristics on JDSF, which will alter the fire behavior characteristics such that reintroduction of fire on the landscape may not imitate naturally occurring fire intensity. There is potential for using JDSF as an area for site-specific research in the use of fire as a management tool. The use of fire can facilitate fire hazard reduction, silvicultural and habitat research, and ecosystem management research. Prescribed fire requires careful implementation to avoid impacts to other resource values, such as rare plants, heritage resources and private property.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-69

From: Eric G. Wertz [EWertz@spi-ind.com]
Posted At: Monday, January 30, 2006 2:05 PM
Conversation: JDSF Public Comment
Subject: JDSF Public Comment

Dear Board Members,

With regards to the current proposed activity associated with Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF) I would like to respond with overwhelming support for the proposed management of Jackson as a demonstration forest. I believe that this park can both be managed for timber production, scientific research as well as public enjoyment. I would like to encourage the board to support the state activities associated with JDSF and allow the forest to be managed as it was initially designated for, demonstration.

Sincerely,
Eric Wertz

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-69

Response to Comment 1

Support for past management and Alternative C1 noted. JDSF is not a park. JDSF will continue to be managed as a research and demonstration forest, including sustainable timber harvesting, while providing recreation opportunities. See General Response 2 and 14.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-70

From: Jay Gayner [burgercreek@hotmail.com]
Posted At: Monday, February 20, 2006 6:47 AM
Conversation: JDSF DEIR
Subject: JDSF DEIR

Dear BOF Members,

The Alternative that I support is C1. I was tempted to select D because that alternative better fits my personal philosophies, but Jackson needs greater flexibility. I suspect, though, that if Alternative C1 is ultimately selected, it will likely result in the EIR being strangled in litigation for some time to come.

Thank you,

Jay Gayner

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-70

Response to Comment 1

Support of Alternative C1 and a plan that allows management flexibility noted. The Board has developed an alternative that strives to balance the concerns of all Californians while remaining consistent with the legislative mandate and Board policy for the state forest system. The ADFMP contains elements from several alternatives and is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest (see also General Response 2). It is hoped that any further litigation can be avoided.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

E-71

Kraemer, Candace

From: Lawrence Wiesner [votewiesner@earthlink.net]
Posted At: Thursday, February 23, 2006 11:03 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest(SCH#2004022025)
Subject: Jackson State Forest(SCH#2004022025)

Gentlemen:

I am writing in regard to the actions to be taken by CDF on Jackson State Forest in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. I would hope that the forest would remain, as it has in the past, a demonstrational forest; where the State can demonstrate the positive effects of sound forestry practices. It is to the credit of the State that it has taken a stand of timber from approximately 10,000 board feet per acre of commercial timber fifty years ago to an average of 40,000 board feet per acre today, while harvesting timber throughout that period. The forest is now in exceptional good condition and affords the opportunity to become a true gem as a demonstrational forest.

Lawrence R. Wiesner
Post Office Box 421
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-0421

Lawrence Wiesner
votewiesner@earthlink.net
Why Wait? Move to EarthLink.

5/23/2006

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-71

Response to Comment 1

Support for past management noted. JDSF will continue to be managed as a research and demonstration forest, including sustainable timber harvesting. See also General Response 2.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-72

From: Matthew Wilkinson [mattywilky@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Thursday, February 09, 2006 7:59 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest- logging
Subject: Jackson State Forest- logging

Mr. Gentry,

1, 2
3
I grew up visiting the Jackson State Forest several times a year as retreats from my family's more urban home in the bay area. I remember as a child my fascination with the immensity of the forest and the bounty of salmon in the river. I also remember my feeling of horror at seeing for the first time the devastation caused by increased logging and clear cutting inside Jackson State Forest. Seeing the bare hillsides and the river devoid of spawning salmon made a huge and lasting impression on me of the power of mankind to destroy nature.

4
I beg you to reconsider the plan to go ahead with the same logging practices that have caused so much destruction there. I still visit the area many times a year, and I feel I have an interest in seeing this piece of our shared heritage protected and maintained for generations to come. Please extend the 60 period of review in order that more people may have a chance to review the issue and comment on it. The State Forests are a public resource and I think more people should be given a chance to become involved in the debate of how to manage them.

Thank you very much,

Matthew Wilkinson
854 56th St.
Oakland CA 94608

Yahoo! Mail
Use Photomail to share photos without annoying attachments.

5000000

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-72

Response to Comment 1

The ADFMMP calls for a reduction in the annual harvest of timber when compared to the previous management plan. See General Response 2 and 15.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 3

See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 5.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-73

From: GLENDON BOOTHE [g_boothe@sbcglobal.net]
Posted At: Monday, February 20, 2006 8:59 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest Logging
Subject: Jackson State Forest Logging

Please preserve as much of this beautiful forest as possible-if we cut it all down as proposed, there will be nothing left for future generations to enjoy, as well as all the rest of us in this present lifetime!!!!!!!!!!!! NO to the planned debauchery of Jackson State Forest! Thankyou, GRB

5/12/2006

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-73

Response to Comment 1

See General Responses 2, 15 and 16.

Opposition to the proposed DFMP noted. The DFMP does not propose to “cut it all down”. The main portion of JDSF was purchased by the State over a period of years from 1947 to 1951 from a private seller. At that time, most of the lands were in a cut-over condition, with relatively low stocking. CDF has consistently harvested well below the growth of the forest, resulting in an ever increasing inventory of larger, older trees. The forest that you see today is the result of 60 years of forest management that included timber harvesting.

The ADFMP has placed greater emphasis on protection and restoration, with the goal of improving all resource values over time in comparison to existing conditions. The timber harvest level under the ADFMP is based on providing a varied landscape with a set of forest structures designed to support a viable research and demonstration program rather than a goal of a particular level of production. This analysis has resulted in a planned average annual harvest level of approximately 20 to 25 million board feet which is well below the current growth. In addition, the commitment to monitoring and adaptive management will ensure not only that harvest does not exceed growth, but that other timber related resource conditions are on the correct trajectory to meet the stated management goals. Potential impacts to other resource values have been mitigated to “less than significant”.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-74

From: Evie Dwyer [evie@federales.com]
Posted At: Sunday, February 12, 2006 11:00 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Park
Subject: Jackson State Park

I want to save the beauty of this park and nearby area for me children and grandchildren. My family has camped here as well as other Calif. State Parks, and they have provided us wonderful vacations to enjoy the beauty of the outdoors as well as nurture our family relationships. We have never been able to afford fancy vacations, and I see all the beautiful State Parks at risk from commercial interests. I hope you will examine your plans. Sincerely, Evelyn Dwyer

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-74

Response to Comment 1

See General Responses 2, 14 and 15.

JDSF is not a park. It has been actively managed for the past 60 years to demonstrate maximum sustained production of high quality timber products. It remains protected from land use conversion to other purposes, including making it a park or reserve. Past management has resulted in a landscape that is conducive to multiple-use, including recreation. The ADFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources, while remaining consistent with enabling legislation. Proposed management will continue with harvest levels set well below growth. Implementation of the ADFMP is not expected to cause significant adverse environmental impacts.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-75

From: Gene Wixson [gnwixson@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Sunday, February 05, 2006 8:59 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

Board members,

I support alternative B in the Jackson forest EIR. I feel that we have plenty of underused parks in this state and not nearly enough usable timberland. It is time to let the foresters and science again have control of this valuable resource. The state of California as well as Mendocino county need the income as well as the jobs that this forest can again provide.

Sincerely,
Gene Wixson
24251 Sherwood Rd.

Willits Ca. 95490

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around <http://mail.yahoo.com>

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-75

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative B noted. JDSF will remain a demonstration forest. See response to Form Letter 4. See also General Response 2.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-74

From: Virginia Matzek [vam@stanford.edu]
Posted At: Monday, February 13, 2006 11:43 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest--a special place!
Subject: Jackson State Forest--a special place!

Feb 13, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

I've been visiting the beautiful state parks and state forests along the North Coast for years, and I know what a wonderful place the Jackson State Forest is. It is contiguous with more heavily visited forests where I have hiked, watched birds, collected mushrooms, and photographed wildflowers. It provides animal habitat and critically important watershed services.

3 I will be disappointed if you don't adopt the so-called "Alternative F" for dealing with timber harvesting in this valuable resource.

We have to be responsible stewards for the future, or else there is no future. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Virginia Matzek
2745 Kipling St
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2428

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-76

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 12.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 3

Support for Alternative F noted. The Board has found that some elements of Alternative F may not comply with legislation and policy related to state forest management (see DEIR Table VI.1). The ADFMP has been developed by blending the elements and management strategies of several Alternatives, including Alternative F. This includes accelerated implementation of the Road Management Plan, a reduction in the use of even-age management and clearcutting, a reduction in the planned timber harvest level, an increase in the area dedicated to development of older forest and late-seral forest conditions, an increase in resource protection and restoration measures, such as snag retention and LWD placement, and a management emphasis on research, demonstration and education. The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products. Please see General Response 2, 4, and 15.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

e-78

From: tjh2ogal@yahoo.com
Posted At: Thursday, February 02, 2006 6:10 PM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest

Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I strongly support the proposed management plan for Jackson State Forest. I support the plan's commercial logging, more than adequate stream protection measures, proper use of herbicide(s), and continued recreational use as is already established.

I personally want Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF) maintained as a demonstration redwood/doug fir forest as originally authorized, this would include all forms of forest management as well as the multiple uses of habitat, recreation, education and research.

The Draft EIR concludes that the state's proposed (for profit) commercial logging plan (Alternative C1) can be carried out with "less than significant environmental impacts." I support this conclusion wholeheartedly!

The draft environmental document is very thorough and comprehensive. In my opinion, the Draft EIR meets and exceeds its legal obligation to provide the information and analysis necessary to be able to make informed judgements on the environmental effects of the project under the CEQA guidelines established for environmental protection.

Sincerely,

Tamara Hanna
PO Box 2826
Chino, California 91708
cc:
Senator Bob Margett
Assembly Member Gloria Negrete McLeod
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-78

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative C1 and the completeness of the DEIR noted. JDSF will remain a demonstration forest. The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products. See also General Response 14.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-79

From: Ray Parsons [oldpar@sbcglobal.net]
Posted At: Friday, February 10, 2006 8:15 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

Hi,

- 1 Please keep destructive logging out of Jackson
- 2 State Forest and extend the public comment period. Thank you.

Nancy Parsons
1130 Miles Ave.
Pacific Grove, Ca. 93950

5/22/2006

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-79

Response to Comment 1

Desire to end all harvesting noted. See General Response 2, 15, and 16.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 5.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-80

From: William O'Neil [wco7171@msn.com]
Posted At: Thursday, February 09, 2006 10:45 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

1 Dear Mr. Gentry; Please reject the current CDF C-1 EIR for Jackson Forest ,which allows extensive
2 harvesting in this sensitive ecosystem. Could you also extend the public comment period for
another 60 days, so interested parties have a chance to study the new EIR.
Thank you,

Sincerely,- William O'Neil

5/22/2006

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-80

Response to Comment 1

Opposition to Alternative C1 noted. The Board has developed an alternative that strives to balance the concerns of all Californians while remaining consistent with the legislative mandate and Board policy for the state forest system. The ADFMP is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest. See also General Response 2, 15, and 16.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 5.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-81

Kraemer, Candace

From: M Rothman [megrothman@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Friday, February 10, 2006 9:03 AM
Conversation: Regarding Jackson State Forest
Subject: Regarding Jackson State Forest

Dear George Gentry,

I love this land. My family has a cabin surrounded by this forest.

1 { I respectfully request that you extend the public comment period another 60 days.
The complexity and sheer volume of the 1500-page EIR makes it difficult for the public to respond during the too-brief period allowed for public comment.

2 Let's make sure a plan is in place that will emphasize other values
3,4 besides timber extraction, one that will protect old growth, wildlife,
5,6,7 watersheds, recreation, and the scenic beauty of California's largest state forest.

Meg Rothman

11/13/2007

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-81

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 5.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 2, 15 and 16.

Response to Comment 3

See General Response 8.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 12.

Response to Comment 5

See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 6

See General Response 14.

Response to Comment 7

The Board recognizes that timber operations can lead to negative impacts on the aesthetics of an area, however determining specific “thresholds of significance” is highly personal and subjective (see General Response 6). The DEIR/RDEIR analysis of these potential impacts found that application of several mitigation measures would reduce the potential negative impacts to less than significant. A detailed discussion of Aesthetic Resources, including impacts, thresholds of significance, and mitigation measures can be found in section VII.2 and VIII-94 of the DEIR. Additional analysis of aesthetics, as related to recreation, can be found in section VII.14. Further analysis of potential impacts to aesthetic resources relating to Alternative G and the ADFMP can be found in RDEIR section III.2 and III.14. See also General Response 14.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-82

From: tomhazelleaf@yahoo.com
Posted At: Thursday, February 09, 2006 3:25 PM
Conversation: Support draft EIR Alternative F
Subject: Support draft EIR Alternative F

Dear Members of the Board:

Please support draft EIR Alternative F for the Jackson State Forest.

Alternative F provides substantial environmental protection and enhances the preservation of fish and wildlife while still allowing timber production.

It is time for the Jackson State Forest to have reasonable management.

Tom Hazelleaf
4656 Fir Avenue
Seal Beach, CA 90740

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-82

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative F noted. The Board has found that some elements of Alternative F may not comply with legislation and policy related to state forest management (see DEIR Table VI.1). The ADFFMP has been developed by blending the elements and management strategies of several Alternatives, including Alternative F. This includes accelerated implementation of the Road Management Plan, a reduction in the use of even-age management and clearcutting, a reduction in the planned timber harvest level, an increase in the area dedicated to development of older forest and late-seral forest conditions, an increase in resource protection and restoration measures, such as snag retention and LWD placement, and a management emphasis on research, demonstration and education. The ADFFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources, while remaining consistent with enabling legislation. The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products. Implementation of the ADFFMP is not expected to cause significant adverse environmental impacts. Please see General Response 2, 4, 11, 12, and 15.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-83

From: Jonny Vasic [jvasic@msn.com]
Posted At: Monday, February 27, 2006 12:03 AM
Conversation: Save the Jackson Redwoods!
Subject: Save the Jackson Redwoods!

1 { I CALL FOR REJECTION of the Draft Management Plan due to the logging of the oldest second-
2,3,4 growth mature forest stands (between 80 and 110 years old), due to plans for widespread
5 clearcutting and other commercial logging, due to inadequate protection for streams from
warmer temperatures and sedimentation which can harm or kill native salmonids, and due to
plans to use herbicides.

6 Also, there are no plans to accomodate more recreation in the area, while much of the
mature forest at key current recreational sites such as Brandon Gulch and West Chamberlain
Creek areas will be logged, while leaving just small "buffer areas near trails
and campgrounds -- and some logging can even occur within these "buffer areas!

7 The best alternative presented is Alternative E which would manage the forest for a return
to late-seral forest conditions. However, even that alternative is lacking because it
does not call for (or allot funds for) the decommissioning of hundreds of miles of roads
which wreak havoc on stream habitat or the active restoration of salmon habitat in
streams. Thus, the Proposed Alternative C1, and the Draft JDSF plan in general, should
be rejected!

Don't just search. Find. Check out the new MSN Search!
<http://search.msn.click-url.com/go/onm00200636ave/direct/01/>

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-83

See Response to Form Letter 2

Response to Comment 1

Opposition to Alternative C1 noted. See General Response 9.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 3

The legislative mandate for the forest is to demonstrate sustainable and economic forest management. The economic component of this mandate requires the use of commercial logging operations. The timber harvest level under the ADFMP is based on providing a varied landscape with a set of forest structures designed to support a viable research and demonstration program rather than a goal of a particular level of production. This analysis has resulted in a planned average annual harvest level of approximately 20 to 25 million board feet which is well below the current growth. In addition, the commitment to monitoring and adaptive management will ensure not only that harvest does not exceed growth, but that other timber related resource conditions are on the correct trajectory to meet the stated management goals. Potential impacts to other resource values have been mitigated to "less than significant". See also General Response 16.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 5

See General Response 7.

Response to Comment 6

See General Response 14. The preparation of a timber harvest plan is a functional equivalent of the EIR process under CEQA. This includes an impacts assessment, a multidisciplinary agency review process and public review. Since the site-specific management actions and possible effects cannot be pre-determined with any degree of certainty, it is preferable to conduct environmental assessment and to design specific mitigation while each project is planned designed and reviewed. See DEIR section VII.14.3 for further discussion of proposed management measures relating to recreation.

Response to Comment 7

See General Response 13.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-84

From: Richard Birecki [richbirecki2000@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Friday, February 10, 2006 11:42 AM
Conversation: please protect redwoods
Subject: please protect redwoods

Feb 10, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

I ant my kids tyo be able top see redwoods. These beautiful trees should be protected.
There ned to be wild, pristine places. Redwoods help asorb carbon dioxide, provide shade,
and beauty.

Please help protect them!

Thanks
Richard

Sincerely,

Richard Birecki
3001 Ross Rd
Palo Alto, CA 94303-4103

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-84

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2, 14, and 15. Support for a preservation oriented management approach noted. JDSF is not a park or wilderness area. It has been actively managed for the past 60 years to demonstrate maximum sustained production of high quality timber products. It remains protected from land use conversion to other purposes, including making it a park or reserve. Past management has resulted in a landscape that is conducive to multiple-use, including enjoyment of natural beauty and other forms of recreation. Current trends in forest management place greater emphasis on developing practices that provide increased protection to the non-timber resource values including, but not limited to, aquatic and wildlife habitat, aesthetics, and recreation. Although aesthetics will not be adopted as the primary purpose of the forest, the ADFFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources, while remaining consistent with enabling legislation.

Past management has consistently harvested well below the growth of the forest, resulting in an ever increasing inventory of larger, older trees. Proposed management will continue with harvest levels set well below growth. The protection from conversion to other land uses and the increase in standing timber insures that JDSF serves as a carbon "sink". A detailed discussion of carbon sequestration as related to the various alternatives can be found in section VII.16 of the DEIR and section III.16 of the RDEIR. See also Response to E-116.

Implementation of the ADFFMP is not expected to cause significant adverse environmental impacts.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-85

From: marcuse@history.ucsb.edu
Posted At: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 3:36 PM
Conversation: Support Alternative F for Jackson State Forest
Subject: Support Alternative F for Jackson State Forest

Dear Members of the Board:

Please don't allow logging in Jackson State Forest. Alternative F, the "Older Forest Emphasis" is a much better plan that looks to our future without destroying never-renewable resources.

Sincerely,

Harold Marcuse
932 West Campus Ln.
Goleta, CA 93117-4343

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-85

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2,15, and 16. Alternative F does allow logging. Alternative F is estimated to have produced an average annual harvest of 19.3 million board feet during the first decade. The ADFMP estimates an average annual harvest of approximately 20 to 25 million board feet during the first decade. As noted in the general response listed above, this forest was purchased by the State in a cut-over condition and 60 years of active management, including substantial timber harvesting, has produced the forest that you see today, which clearly demonstrates that forests are not “never-renewable resources”. Under the ADFMP remnant old growth trees and stands will be protected from harvest (see General Response 8) and increasing late seral habitat and older forest structure will be one of the goals of future management (see General Response 9, 11 and 12).

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-86

Kraemer, Candace

From: Sergio Monteiro [monteiroserge@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Saturday, February 25, 2006 1:07 PM
Conversation: Public comment on the Dract Management Plan
Subject: Public comment on the Dract Management Plan

This letter is about the Draft Management Plan

1 I am calling for the rejection of the raft Management Plan. I oppose the logging of the oldest second-
2 growth mature forest stands. According to what I read on books and professional journals the
3 clearcutting and similar commercial logging causes damage to the streams, fish and the environment in
general. Commercial logging practices are also a sore to the eye. Some humans are capable of
aesthetics feelings and these have as much rights as the ones that measure everything by the immediate
economic advantage for a limited number of persons.

4 The best alternative presented is Alternative E which would manage the forest for a return to a closer
condition to the one existing when the white invaders from Europe arrived. Note that even that
alternative is lacking strength because it does not call for (or allot funds for) the decommissioning of
hundreds of miles of roads which wreak havoc on stream habitat or the active restoration of salmon
habitat in streams. Consequently I am opposing Proposed Alternative C1, and the Draft JDSF plan in
general, which should be rejected.

Sergio Monteiro
1325 Wellesley Ave. # 209
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 442 - 9107
monteiroserge@yahoo.com



Sergio Monteiro
monteiroserge@yahoo.com

Yahoo! Mail
Bring photos to life! [New PhotoMail](#) makes sharing a breeze.

9/19/2007

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-86

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 9.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 10, 11, 12 and 15. The commenter fails to provide any reference to published materials so a reasoned response is not possible.

Response to Comment 3

The Board recognizes that timber operations can lead to negative impacts on the aesthetics of an area, however determining specific “thresholds of significance” is highly personal and subjective (see General Response 6). The DEIR/RDEIR analysis of these potential impacts found that application of several mitigation measures would reduce the potential negative impacts to less than significant. A detailed discussion of Aesthetic Resources, including impacts, thresholds of significance, and mitigation measures can be found in section VII.2 and VIII-94 of the DEIR. Additional analysis of aesthetics, as related to recreation, can be found in section VII.14. Further analysis of potential impacts to aesthetic resources relating to Alternative G and the ADFMP can be found in RDEIR section III.2 and III.14. See also General Response 14.

Unlike parks, the management of JDSF is not aimed primarily at aesthetics and recreation. The enabling legislation that guides the management of JDSF declared it to be in the public interest to purchase cut-over private lands “for the purpose of demonstrating economical forest management” (PRC4531) using “forest management practices designed to achieve maximum sustained production of high quality timber products while giving consideration to values relating to recreation, watershed, wildlife, range and forage, fisheries and aesthetic enjoyment” (PRC 4651).

Current trends in forest management place greater emphasis on developing practices that provide increased protection to the non-timber resource values including, but not limited to, aquatic and wildlife habitat, aesthetics, and recreation. Although aesthetics will not be adopted as the primary purpose of the forest, the ADFMP represents significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources, while remaining consistent with enabling legislation.

Response to Comment 4

See response to Form Letter 2. Opposition to the DFMP and qualified support of Alternative E noted.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-87

From: Mike Marvier [MMarvier@spi-ind.com]
Posted At: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 9:10 AM
Conversation: RPF SUPPORT NEEDED FOR JACKSON DEMONSTRATION STATE FOREST (JDSF)
Subject: RPF SUPPORT NEEDED FOR JACKSON DEMONSTRATION STATE FOREST (JDSF)

Please support Alternative C1 - the Preferred Alternative.

Thanks

Mike A. Marvier
RPF 2629

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-87

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative C1 noted.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-88

From: Becca Rollins [beccarollins@hotmail.com]
Posted At: Friday, February 10, 2006 11:41 AM
Conversation: Redwoods=happiness
Subject: Redwoods=happiness

Feb 10, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

Please adopt and implement Alternative F.

Thank you,

Becca Rollins
Torrance, California

Sincerely,

Becca Rollins
4733 Highgrove Ave
Torrance, CA 90505-5519

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-88

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative F noted.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Kraemer, Candace

E-89

From: Stephen Vernon [svlaw@ix.netcom.com]
Posted At: Thursday, February 16, 2006 4:29 PM
Conversation: Please Don't Approve the Jackson State Forest Draft EIR
Subject: Please Don't Approve the Jackson State Forest Draft EIR

George D. Gentry, Executive Officer
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection

Re: Jackson State Forest Draft EIR

Dear Mr. Gentry:

See FL 5 1 Alternative C-1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Jackson "Demonstration" State Forest would permit too much logging and provide too little protection for irreplaceable old-growth forest, wildlife habitat, and watersheds. The resulting permanent damage to these values and to our state would far outweigh the short term, principally financial benefits, principally to logging interests.

2 As a former Washingtonian who has seen the long term devastation of clearcutting closely, I am particularly upset about the disingenuous permission for clearcutting (which evokes the Japanese requests to kill whales for "research," that somehow end up in restaurants).

3 The importance of your decision transcends merely local considerations: it is also important to preserve the credibility of our rich country when we ask other, poor countries to preserve their forests and wildlife.

Accordingly, please reject the draft environmental impact report for Jackson Demonstration State Forest, and insist upon an alternative that would:

- preserve our ecosystem heritage, especially old growth;
protect our water;
avoid poisonous, polluting herbicide use;
and eliminate clearcutting.

Thank you,

Stephen Vernon
VERNON LAW OFFICE
2300 Geng Road, Suite 200
Palo Alto, California 94303-3323
Direct: (650) 493-8483
Fax: (650) 493-6160
svlaw@ix.netcom.com

5/22/2006

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-89

See response to Form Letter 5.

Response to Comment 1

The value of managing JDSF as a research and demonstration forest goes far beyond the short term financial gains (see General Response 2). The enabling legislation that guides the management of JDSF declared it to be in the public interest to purchase cut-over private lands “for the purpose of demonstrating economical forest management” (PRC4531) using “forest management practices designed to achieve maximum sustained production of high quality timber products while giving consideration to values relating to recreation, watershed, wildlife, range and forage, fisheries and aesthetic enjoyment (PRC 4651). The ADFMP represents state of the art management practices and implementation of the plan is not expected to produce significant adverse environmental impacts. The plan incorporates significant advancement in the management practices aimed at protection and restoration of environmental resources, while remaining consistent with enabling legislation. See General Response 8, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 17.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 10. Regulation of logging in California incorporates high levels of resource protection when compared to many other timber producing regions, including the State of Washington. However, California imports approximately 70% of its forest products with much of that coming from regions with lower levels of environmental protection. This serves to highlight the value of JDSF for the purpose of providing an area dedicated to research and demonstration of sustainable, economic forest management here in California.

Response to Comment 3

The Board supports the idea that California can demonstrate sustainable, economic forest management. By demonstrating forest management that incorporates high levels of resource protection as a viable enterprise that can be economically and environmentally sustainable, JDSF serves this purpose.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-90

From: oaklandis@hotmail.com
Posted At: Tuesday, February 14, 2006 1:12 PM
Conversation: Management Plan
Subject: Management Plan

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

- 1 The draft EIR is a cumbersome, inaccessible, and overpriced tome that seems intended to keep out public scrutiny. However, one thing is certain. It is wrong in its conclusions
- 2 regarding the various alternatives. Additionally, it fails to acknowledge the viability
- 3 and importance of restoration of our state forest.
- 4 I oppose the proposed managemnt plan. I oppose the draft EIR. I oppose clearcutting. I favor restoration and proper stewardship of our public lands. I urge you to do the same.

Sincerely,

scott kravitz
3827 cesar chavez st.
san francisco, California 94131
cc:
Senator Carole Migden
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
Assembly Member Mark Leno
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-90

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 5.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 3. The commenter fails to provide any specifics regarding the claim that the DEIR is wrong in its analysis of the alternatives. A reasoned response is not possible.

Response to Comment 3

See General Response 4. The ADFMP has been developed by blending the elements and management strategies of several alternatives. The plan emphasizes that restoration and maintenance of functioning ecological systems is of high priority. Proposed management activities in the ADFMP include: accelerated implementation of the Road Management Plan, a reduction in the use of even-age management and clearcutting, a reduction in the planned timber harvest level, an increase in the area dedicated to development of late-seral forest conditions and older forest structure, an increase in resource protection and restoration measures, such as snag retention and LWD placement, and a management emphasis on research, demonstration and education. 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 in response to the results that are observed. The plan is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest. The Board and CAL FIRE believe that the Administrative Draft Forest Management Plan and DEIR/RDEIR have sufficiently addressed the potential environmental impacts and, in addition, allowed the flexibility needed in a management plan to monitor and adjust management activities as needed. See also General Response 2 and 15.

Response to Comment 4

Opposition to the DFMP and DEIR noted. See General Response 10.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-91

From: Kevin Casey [kcasey@fs.fed.us]
Posted At: Monday, January 30, 2006 2:07 PM
Conversation: JSDF
Subject: JSDF

Board of Forestry,

Stop the madness...allow JSDF to perform its mandated function.
Approve the preferred alternative and put this forest BACK TO WORK.

/s/ K. Casey
RPF #2698
+++++
Kevin Casey
Vegetation Inventory & Monitoring
Remote Sensing Lab, McClellan, CA
office: 916-640-1252
mobile: 530-305-6446
kcasey@fs.fed.us
+++++

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-91

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2. The Board agrees that it would be highly beneficial for the State Forest to fully resume management activities, so the Board is working actively to certify the EIR and approve a management plan.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

E-92

Kraemer, Candace

From: Hal Wagenet - Supervisor [hal@hals-pals.org]
Posted At: Sunday, February 26, 2006 3:00 PM
Conversation: JDSF DEIR comment
Subject: JDSF DEIR comment

Dear YG and the Board;

We've done our best in Mendocino County.

The rest is up to you...

Best Regards,

Hal Wagenet
3rd District Supervisor
Mendocino County

Email Letter E-92

Response to Comment 1
Comment noted.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-93

From: Louise Young [loyo@mcn.org]
Posted At: Sunday, February 19, 2006 5:23 PM
Conversation: Support for Alternative "D" JDSF Management Plan EIR
Subject: Support for Alternative "D" JDSF Management Plan EIR

Dear Board members,

I have been a Mendocino County resident and homeowner for nine years. I have participated actively in efforts to reach a balanced approach to the JDSF Management Plan EIR since I moved here.

I applaud the decision of the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors in choosing Alternative "D" as their option. This is not so much a compromise as a reflection of changing times in Mendocino County. It does not mean an end to logging, but brings forward the long neglected opportunity to develop some areas of Jackson Demonstration State Forest for recreational use.

I also support adoption of Alternative "D" as the most viable approach for proper management of a forest environment.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Louise Young
43300 Airport Road
Little River, CA 95456
e-mail: loyo@mcn.org

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-93

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative D noted. See also General Response 14. The ADFMP is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-94

From: Mark Pritchard [mark.pritchard@cranemills.com]

Posted At: Tuesday, January 31, 2006 9:01 AM

Please support the Jackson State Demonstration forest as a productive and healthy forest for sustaining research and forest products for the state of California

Mark Pritchard
7200 Wells Fargo Way
Corning, CA
96021

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-94

Response to Comment 1

The ADFMP is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest. See also General Response 2 and 15.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

e-95

From: Perrin Lam [plamcopy@ix.netcom.com]
Posted At: Thursday, February 16, 2006 3:58 PM

Dear sir,

A fox shouldn't be in charge of a henhouse.

Resign while you still have a shred of integrity.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-95

Response to Comment 1

Comment noted.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-96

From: dotischler@earthlink.net
Posted At: Thursday, February 02, 2006 9:24 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

1 The proposed management plan for the Jackson State forest is deeply flawed and one-side.
2 ~~It ignores the value of the forest in maintaining a healthy Mendocino salmon fishery and~~
falls to exploit the forest's potential for education, research, and non-motorized
recreation. In the long term these other uses will provide more benefit to the local
economy and more value to the rest of Californians.

Sincerely, Dan Tischler (fisherman, diver, mushroom hunter, hiker, etc) 6249 Valroy Dr San Jose

Sincerely,

Dan Tischler
6249 Valroy Dr
San Jose, California 95123
cc:
Senator Abel Maldonado
Assembly Member Rebecca Cohn
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-96

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 2 and 14.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-98

From: rpe3@eoni.com
Posted At: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 11:33 AM
Conversation: Jackson State Forest
Subject: Jackson State Forest

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

I strongly support the proposed management plan for Jackson State Forest. Whatever silvicultural prescription you feel necessary should be implemented.

This "leave it alone" attitude that is espoused by many environmental groups is wasteful and deleterious to the forests of our country. I believe we should let the California state forestry staff do their jobs without the political interference that abounds today.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Robert Ellingson
PO Box 866
Baker City, Oregon 97814

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-98

Response to Comment 1

Support of DFMP and management flexibility noted. The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-100

From: Alvin Sacks [alvin_sacks@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Thursday, February 09, 2006 3:49 PM
Conversation: Comment on proposed change
Subject: Comment on proposed change

- 1 Your proposed "change" back to logging as usual (only more so) is an insult to the public intelligence. We simply cannot sacrifice our precious forest lands to the whims of corporate greed. The law was appropriately changed before, and should not be reversed.
- 2 Further, the time for public comment is absurdly short and should be doubled. Consider the length of the document!

Al Sacks

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around <http://mail.yahoo.com>

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-100

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2, 15, 16, and 17. The forest is not being managed based on “whims of corporate greed”. The legislation that guides the management of the state forest systems remains unchanged. The ADFMP calls for a reduction in harvest levels over the previous management plan.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 5.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-101

From: Todd Enders [toddenders@hotmail.com]
Posted At: Friday, February 10, 2006 5:18 PM
Conversation: COMMENT ON JACKSON EIR: disturbed by proposed decrease in value of state asset
Subject: COMMENT ON JACKSON EIR: disturbed by proposed decrease in value of state asset

George D. Gentry, Executive Officer
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Mr. Gentry:

1 I am alarmed at the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Jackson Demonstration State Forest. I feel the proposed project will permanently degrade the value of a public asset and impact critical parts of our infrastructure and food supply.

2 Alternative C-1 permits penny-foolish, pound-foolish logging practices that injure the value of this asset owned by the public, to make life easier on corporations. Corporations are not California citizens, and are supposed to die off if they can't compete without a government handout.

3 4 I urge you to develop an alternative that would eliminate all clear-cutting, protect old-growth sections of forest from any logging, improve the stream-side and watershed buffers, and ban the use of poisons and herbicides.
5 -- except on corporate welfare recipients.

6 Also, the public comment period should be extended. Few of us in the public have time to even hear about an EIR being issued in the holiday shadow, much less to read it.

I hope you'll see fit to adjust your proposal such that it serves the public's interest instead of the interests of corporations.

Thank you,

Todd Enders
650 Church St. #1
San Francisco, CA 94114

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-101

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2. The commenter is unclear how the proposed project will “permanently degrade the value of a public asset and impact critical parts of our infrastructure and food supply”. A reasoned response is not possible.

The Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan (ADFFMP), based on Alternative G, establishes a high degree of protection to all of the associated resource values. 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 (ADFFMP, Chapter 5). 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 in response to the results that are observed. The commitment to monitoring and adaptive management will ensure that resource conditions are on the correct trajectory to meet the stated management goals. The plan is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest. The management plan represents state of the art management practices and implementation of the plan is not expected to produce significant adverse environmental impacts.

The enabling legislation requires that the forest is actively managed to demonstrate sustainable and economic forest management. The comment provides no supporting information on the claim that harvesting on JDSF provides a “government handout” for corporations. All sales greater than 100,000 board feet and/or \$10,000 in value are required to be sold through a bid process to ensure that the State receives fair market value. The sale of timber will result in both direct and indirect timber related employment, but that does not equate to a “handout”.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 3

See General Response 8.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 11.

Response to Comment 5

See General Response 7.

Response to Comment 6

See General Response 5.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-103

From: Gail Macmillan [gail@theredwoods.org]
Posted At: Friday, February 10, 2006 3:35 PM
Conversation: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan
Subject: Comments on Jackson State Demonstration Forest Management Plan

Feb 10, 2006

California State Forestry Board California State Forestry Board P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244

Dear California State Forestry Board ,

I have visisted the Jackson Demonstration State Forest and strongly urge you to adopt Alternative F, the "Older Forest Emphasis" plan for management.

Alternative F would enhance fish and wildlife habitat as well as balance environmental protection with a timber program.

This forest is an important link in the coastal redwood range and needs to managed as such to ensure its viability as a healthy ecosystem.

I urge you to adopt the meaningful reforms that are outlined in Alternative F. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Gail Macmillan
127 Baltimore Ave
Corte Madera, CA 94925-1420

Email Letter E-103

Response to Comment 1

Support for Alternative F noted. See response to Form Letter 6 and 7 in the Form Letter section. Also see General Response 9, 11 and 12.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-104

From: ginafarr@farrvisions.com
Posted At: Thursday, February 02, 2006 4:12 PM
Conversation: Oppose mgmt plan *Jackson State Forest*
Subject: Oppose mgmt plan *Jackson State Forest*

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

Dear Members Board of Forestry,

- 1 { My family and I very strongly OPPOSE the proposed management plan for Jackson State Forest.
Jackson State should be restored to an old growth redwood forest for all of us to enjoy and to protect important wildlife habitat.
The Draft EIR completely omits the restoration that we are asking for. This truly IS our land, the American public and California residents, and not every potentially money-making dime of it belongs to corporate interests.
- 2 { Further, you have failed to meet your obligation to provide the information and analysis the public needs.
- 3 { Are you responsible for the careful managements of our treasured forests on behalf of everyone, or are you simply a tool of the logging industry and opposed to the public interest?
- 4 { We need an alternative to clear-cutting and habitat/recreational destruction.

Sincerely,

Gina Farr
336 Forrest Ave
Fairfax, California 94930
cc:
Senator Carole Migden
Assembly Member Joe Nation
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-104

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2. JDSF is not a park or reserve. The legislative mandate that created JDSF and guides its management is very clear that demonstration of sustainable and economic forest management is one of the primary purposes of JDSF. By providing research opportunities and demonstrating responsible and innovative forest management techniques JDSF influences management practices well beyond its boundaries. To support the research and demonstration mandate there has been an effort to maintain a viable outdoor laboratory by managing the forest to create diverse stand and habitat types. This diversity is needed to assess the effects of a broad range of management activities. The research conducted on JDSF will help to guide the development of improved management practices and future forest practice rules. Requests to manage JDSF for a single purpose, such as development of late seral and old-growth stand conditions, while important, will severely limit the research and demonstration potential of the forest. The diverse habitats created by a broad spectrum of management practices has allowed for flexibility and opportunity for research as the issues and concerns involved in forest management have evolved over the past 50 years. In addition, many wildlife species, including some threatened and endangered species, thrive in areas that contain a diversity of habitat types. Research and demonstration efforts conducted on JDSF include projects relating to timber production, ecological processes, restoration and wildlife. Corporate interests do not guide the management of JDSF.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 3.

Response to Comment 3

The Board has developed an alternative that strives to balance the concerns of all Californians while remaining consistent with the legislative mandate and Board policy for the state forest system. The ADFMP is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest. See General Response 2.

Response to Comment 4

See General Response 4, 10, 11, 12 and 14.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-105

From: lila wilkinson [lilaanne55@yahoo.com]
Posted At: Thursday, February 09, 2006 7:30 PM
Conversation: Please DON'T log Jackson State Forest!!
Subject: Please DON'T log Jackson State Forest!!

To Whom it May Concern,
My family has a cabin on HWY 20. I grew up camping and hiking in Jackson State Forest. It is one of the most beautiful places on earth but after logging, the lush hillsides became a muddy wasteland. The naked exposed forest floor no longer was covered in sword ferns and thimble berries. Please help to preserve the beauty and wildlife that makes Jackson State Forest such a special place to visit. Please DON'T allow more logging in Jackson State Forest.

Sincerely,

Lila Wilkinson
1010 Mckinley Ave.
Oakland Ca. 94610

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around <http://mail.yahoo.com>

Email Letter E-105

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2. JDSF was purchased in a largely cut over condition from a private seller approximately 50 years ago. It has been actively managed for the past 50 years to demonstrate maximum sustained production of high quality timber products. Past management has resulted in a landscape that is conducive to multiple-use, including enjoyment of natural beauty and other forms of recreation. The Board recognizes that timber operations can lead to negative impacts on the aesthetics of an area, however determining specific "thresholds of significance" is highly personal and subjective (see General Response 6). Many of the potential impacts of logging are temporary and do not result significant impacts to associated resource values. Mitigation measures have been developed to reduce the potential aesthetic impacts of timber operations to less than significant. This includes implementation of restrictions on the use of even-aged silvicultural practices and timber operations adjacent to special concern areas (see Section VII.2 of the DEIR). Current trends in forest management place greater emphasis on developing practices that provide increased protection to the non-timber resource values including, but not limited to, aquatic and wildlife habitat, aesthetics, and recreation. The management plan represents state of the art management practices and implementation of the plan is not expected to produce significant adverse environmental impacts (See General Response 10, 11, and 12).

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.

Kraemer, Candace

E-106

From: GLENDON BOOTHE [g_boothe@sbcglobal.net]
Posted At: Thursday, February 09, 2006 7:39 PM
Conversation: Please preserve old growth forestry
Subject: Please preserve old growth forestry

Please save our old Jackson State forest from all the ugly clear-cuts! It is a wonder to get to see the way it is, and so few forests are still this unspoiled.....

Email Letter E-106

Response to Comment 1

See E-105, Response to Comment 1. See also General Response 2 and 10.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-108

SALMON AND STEELHEAD RECOVERY COALITION
California Council Trout Unlimited, California Trout, Inc., Coast Action Group,
Environmental Protection Information Center, Northcoast Environmental Center,
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations,
Salmonid Restoration Federation, Smith River Alliance

February 27, 2006

California Board of Forestry
Post Office Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460
Attention: Y.G. Gentry, Executive Officer

Jackson Demonstration State Forest
Draft Management Plan and DEIR

Dear Mr. Gentry :

On behalf of the Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Coalition (SSRC) we provide the following comments regarding the Forest Management Plan (FMP) for Jackson Demonstration State Forest and the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) regarding the Management Plan. The SSRC is a coalition of fisheries, restoration, and environmental organizations that has worked together since 1996 to promote recovery of salmonid species. The SSRC includes the Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Associations, California Trout, Trout Unlimited, Salmonid Restoration Federation, Northcoast Environmental Center, Humboldt Watershed Council, Environmental Protection Information Center, Coast Action Group, and the Smith River Alliance. We are the alliance that presented the petition on July 28, 2000 to the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) to list coho salmon north of San Francisco as an endangered species under provisions of the California Endangered Species Act (CESA).

1 { Under CESA, state agencies have a duty to help recover endangered species. Fish and Game Code section 2053 says: "... [S]tate agencies should not approve projects as proposed which would ...result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat essential to the continued existence of those species, if there are reasonable and prudent alternatives available consistent with conserving the species or its habitat which would prevent jeopardy."

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Section 2055 provides that: "... [I]t is the policy of this state that all state agencies, boards, and commissions shall seek to conserve endangered species and threatened species and shall utilize their authority in furtherance of the purposes of this chapter."

Section 2061 says: "'Conserve,'" "conserving," and "conservation" mean to use, and the use of, all methods and procedures which are necessary to bring any endangered species or threatened species to the point at which the measures provided pursuant to this chapter are no longer necessary." ...

1

To bring a species "to the point at which the measures provided pursuant to this chapter are no longer necessary" refers to the de-listing of a species, in other words, its recovery. We believe that in order to be in compliance with CESA, the FMP for Jackson must make a significant contribution to the recovery of coho in the Central California Coast ESU.

The DEIR has reproduced Goals and Objectives for the FMP. On Page 27, Goal #3 says: "Watershed and Ecological Processes: Promote and maintain the health, sustainability, ecological processes, and biological diversity of the Forest and watersheds during the conduct of all land management activities." Objective 3-2 says: "Maintain and recruit structural elements necessary for properly functioning habitats. In riparian areas, manage for late seral habitats, while allowing flexibility to conduct research on riparian protection zones. Create or naturally develop recovery habitat for listed species." We strongly support these goals and objectives. However, we do not believe the FMP has succeeded in providing for them and the DEIR has not proposed mitigations to achieve them.

Only Public Recovery Habitat in the Region

The JDSF DEIR correctly points out that the US Forest Service has almost no forest in the redwood region and that most of the region is held as private property:

"The Forest Service has a significant land base in all major forest ecosystem types except for coast redwoods. JDSF represents the most significant amount of acreage dedicated to long-term forest research. Results from research on JDSF are the best option to improve forest practices on private lands (85% of coast redwoods is in private ownership--this high percent is also unique when compared to other forest ecosystem types." [sic]

2

Most of the private forestland near and adjacent to Jackson is not only in private ownership, it is owned by two large timber companies that between them control almost half a million acres in the redwood region of Mendocino County. While the DEIR highlights the lack of public land in relation to the importance of JDSF's demonstration function, it fails to mention that this makes Jackson the only large

2 forest in the area where public trust resources are not competing with private property rights issues or shareholder profits. This is a significant omission. That JDSF's resource base, including its forest stands and fish stocks, are in better shape than those on the neighboring industrial timberland reflects the longer-term view that JDSF has taken and we congratulate you for that. Your intention to continue with a relatively more conservative management approach than industrial timberlands is a plus, but our review of the FMP and DEIR suggest that rather than determining habitat protection based on the needs of listed and unlisted but declining species, that the approach has been to "do a little better" than standard rules. 3 Considering that the standard rules are so poor, we do not believe this is an adequate approach for a public agency to take in relation to public land.

NMFS Guidelines

It is not only our opinion that the standard rules are not adequate to prevent harm to listed salmonids, which is in itself a much less protective standard than contributing to recovery. On June 21, 2000, the late Joseph Blum, then the Liaison to the State of California for the Southwest Region of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) executed a Declaration in support of Environmental Protection Information Center, et al, [plaintiffs] versus Andrea Tuttle et al, [Defendants]. According to the Declaration, Blum is "involved in issues pertaining to salmonid species protected under the ESA and the California Forest Practice Rules." Blum's Declaration says:

"4. NMFS recently reviewed the California Forest Practice Rules during its reconsideration and reversal of its 1998 decision that the Northern California ESU of steelhead did not warrant listing under the ESA. (65 FR 36,074 - Northern California ESU of steelhead listed as threatened on June 7, 2000.) NMFS' review included the Board of Forestry's interim revisions to the California Forest Practice Rules which become effective July 1, 2000 (and are due to expire on December 31, 2000). NMFS concluded that the California Forest Practice Rules with the recently adopted interim changes are inadequate to protect anadromous salmonids or provide for properly functioning habitat conditions. (65 FR 36,074, 36,084-36,085.) Specifically, the California Forest Practice Rules with the interim changes lack critical elements necessary to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse site-specific and cumulative watershed impacts on salmonid populations."

After discussing that NMFS was able to review less than 1% of the hundreds of Timber Harvest Plans, Blum's Declaration continues:

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

"6. NMFS is aware of examples where timber harvest plans which were approved by CDF as in compliance with the California Forest Practice Rules have likely resulted in the take of listed salmonids or adverse modification of their critical habitat. 99% of the timber harvest plans submitted to the CDF are never reviewed by NMFS. Considering the fact that every timber harvest plan NMFS has reviewed would likely have resulted in the take of listed salmonids or adverse modification of critical habitat without NMFS' suggested modifications, it is likely that many of the remaining 99% which NMFS has not reviewed may result in take or adverse modification of critical habitat.

3

"7. In my official capacity as NMFS representative, I have testified before the Board of Forestry and/or it's Interim Committee, on no less than 10 occasions and explained that the California Forest Practice Rules are inadequate to protect and conserve salmonids. I have explained that timber activities under timber harvest plans approved under the California Forest Practice Rules are resulting in the destruction of salmonid habitat and are harming listed salmonids. I have presented the Board of Forestry with guidelines for forestry that, if followed, would reduce the likelihood of harming salmonids and I have provided the Board of Forestry and CDF with approximately 100 scientific citations documenting risks to salmonids associated with timber harvest and related activities. Numerous times, before the Board of Forestry's Interim Committee and before the Board of Forestry itself, I have recommended that the Board of Forestry adopt the NMFS' Short-Term HCP Guidelines as interim rules while the Board of Forestry promulgates permanent rules that incorporate adequate salmonid protection. Further, in my official capacity, I have explained to the Board of Forestry and officials at CDF on numerous occasions that the state may be liable under the ESA for promulgating a regulatory scheme which they are fully aware results in take of listed salmonids and adverse modification of critical habitat. The only action the Board of Forestry has taken to address these issues is the adoption of the inadequate interim changes to the California Forest Practice Rules.

"Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the following information is true and correct.

Executed this 21st day of June, 2000, in Sacramento, California.

[signed by:]
Joseph Blum"

It should be noted that the Interim [Threatened and Impaired Watershed] Rules referred to in the Declaration have been re-authorized by the Board of Forestry (BOF) on a year to year basis and are currently in effect.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

- 3 It is in the context of the overwhelming extent of industrial timber holdings in the region combined with existing inadequate logging rules that we believe the managers at Jackson need to do much more than "a little bit better" than standard rules.
- 4 The DEIR fails to clearly state that timber operations adjacent to and near JDSF have caused significant adverse effects to listed species not only historically, but in recent years and until the present time. The DEIR has also failed to correctly identify that implementation of the FMP will combine with past and ongoing impacts on industrial forestlands to create a cumulative negative impact on listed species including, but not limited to, listed salmonids.
- 5

6 Throughout the FMP and DEIR, language asserts that the riparian zones will be managed to achieve late succession forest conditions. This is a laudable goal. However, the 240 square foot conifer basal area leave standard is not adequate to guarantee a trend toward late succession conditions. Some good sized trees close to the watercourse could fulfill the basal area requirement, leaving the outer part of the already-too-narrow riparian zone dependent on the 70% canopy cover standard. As written, that canopy need not consist of conifers. Without designation of conifers and hardwoods that will be allowed to grow old, die, and decompose as they would in a natural forest, and without specific requirements for conifer distribution and dense understory retention, it is highly unlikely that the riparian area will develop the complex condition that is characteristic of late succession forest.

7 The size of the riparian zones will also prevent development of late succession conditions. First, the size of the Class II Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones (WLPZs) can vary between 50 and 100 feet and there is no information about the conditions that will trigger these varying numbers. Establishing a dark, moist, and cool zone in a 100-foot strip is not feasible. In a 50-foot strip, roughly the length of a small house trailer, achieving these conditions is even more improbable.

8 As the NMFS Declaration makes clear, they have provided specific guidance supported by numerous scientific references. These were presented to the Board of Forestry on December 3, 1999. They recommend the following Aquatic Protection and Management Zones (emphasis added):
For both Class I and Class II waters:
"The outer APZ boundary will be delineated and marked on the ground equal to one site-potential tree height, 180 feet, 50 feet beyond the break in slope at the top of the inner gorge, 50 feet beyond the upper extent of any unstable area that extends down to within 180 feet of a Class I or II water or

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

50 feet beyond the break in slope for all slopes 50% or greater adjacent to the APZ, whichever of these distances is greater....

"All distances are measured horizontally from the edge of the channel migration zone (CMZ), if one exists, or from the outer edge of the bankfull channel on each side of the waters.

8

"Timber operations or other management activities *will not be conducted*, except road-related activities, as described below, within this APZ and within the adjacent bankfull channel. The following restrictions apply within APZs [partial list]:

- "Equipment exclusion zone (EEZ)
- "No salvage....
- "No burning or mechanical site preparation
- "If ground-based yarding will be used on slopes greater than 50% adjacent to the APZ, or if roads are within 100 feet of an APZ, the EEZ will be increased by 100 feet, measured horizontally from the outer edge of the APZ."

9

The FMP and DEIR virtually ignore Class III watercourses even though these have been repeatedly shown to be very significant sources of sediment into Class I and II watercourses. The NMFS guidance document makes the following specific recommendations:

For Class III waters:

"The outer AMZ boundary will be delineated and marked on the ground equal to 100 feet, up to the break in slope for slopes that exceed 50%, or 50 feet beyond the upper extent of any unstable area that extends down to within 100 feet of a Class III water, whichever of these three distances is greater....

"This AMZ may be partially entered for timber management purposes.

10

"Within all Class III water AMZs, the first 30 feet closest to the channel, or 50 feet beyond the upper extent of any unstable area that extends down to within 30 feet of a Class III water, whichever distance is greater, will be delineated and marked on the ground. Timber harvest or other management activities will not be conducted except road-related activities as described, within this inner buffer.

"Between the inner 30 feet buffer closest to the channel and the outer AMZ boundary, the following management restrictions apply:

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

- 10
- "The conifer basal area will not be reduced to less than 50% of the potential of a fully stocked stand.... No harvest within the AMZ will occur except concurrent with commercial thinning or single tree selection in adjacent stands and under the same timber harvest plan, immediately after which, at least 100 square feet basal area per acre will be retained in these adjacent stands.
 - "Equipment exclusion zone (EEZ).
 - "No Salvage....
 - "No burning or mechanical site preparation....
 - "If ground-based yarding will be used on slopes greater than 50% adjacent to the AMZ, or if roads are within 100 feet of an AMZ, the EEZ will be increased by 100 feet...."

In other words, the NMFS recommends protection measures for Class III watercourses that are more protective than what the FMP and DEIR propose for Class II. The NMFS document provides guidance on additional subjects as well.

It cannot be emphasized enough that the NMFS standards were developed specifically for application on private land as regulated by the California Board of Forestry, although they would apply at Jackson if they were in place as state regulations. Presumably, public land should be treated more protectively.

11 A riparian strategy that was conceived with public lands in mind is published as the Aquatic Conservation Strategy of the *Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl*, adopted in April 1994 by the US Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management and their parent agencies. This strategy is generally more protective than the NMFS guidance document. The latter was designed only in relation to the needs of listed salmonids. The US Forest Service standard was designed as a multi-species approach for managed timberland. Its recommendations apply to the same eco-region as Jackson and are the most appropriate, comprehensive, and well-researched guidance document of its kind.

Without going into these standards at great length, we will nevertheless point out that for Class I streams, the riparian management zone is recommended to be at least two site potential trees heights in width, with management limited to advancement of late succession conditions. As much of the Western, Northern, and Southern Watershed Assessment Areas within JDSF are Site II, according to the California Forestry Handbook, each site potential tree height would be approximately 180 feet. Therefore the riparian management zone for Class I

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

- streams would be a minimum of 360 feet on each side of the stream under this US Forest Service standard.
- 11 Why should we do less at Jackson?

Based on the well-researched recommendations of the NMFS, the US Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management and their parent agencies, we believe that the FMP would, at a minimum, cause significant adverse impacts to water temperature, sedimentation, large woody debris recruitment to Class II and Class III streams, channel geomorphology, and riparian habitat. Additionally, based on the above-referenced federal recommendations, we believe that the FMP is highly likely to reduce the number or restrict the range of coho salmon, a listed species. The DEIR has incorrectly identified the implementation of the FMP regarding all of the above to be "less than significant" or "less than significant with mitigation." We disagree.

- 12
- 13 We support implementation of the US Forest Service Aquatic Conservation Strategy as articulated in the *Standards and Guidelines*, referred to previously, as the best means for JDSF to comply with its mandate under CESA to make a significant contribution to the recovery of coho salmon.

Additional Concerns

- 14 There are additional flaws in the FMP and DEIR, including missing or incomplete information and failure to identify significant adverse impacts. We will touch on only a few of them, and briefly.

It is impossible to determine from the information provided, how much late succession forest currently exists at Jackson, where it is located, and how much of that forest is likely to be eliminated by the proposed timber management plan.

15 The DEIR maps do not include a category that is a reasonable surrogate for late succession forest. Eighty to 100 years is often cited as the absolute minimum age of maturity for redwood, with individual trees that can and do survive for 2000 years. Given the emphasis that the FMP claims to place on late succession forest, these omissions are significant.

16 A comparison of the FMP Figure 8 "Forest Vegetation" map with the Figure 6 "Five Year Timber Harvest Projection Estimate" map leads us to conclude that much of the existing older second growth forest, that which is most likely to mature into late succession forest soonest, is designated to be logged. This is not discussed in the DEIR and is a significant omission. If our conclusion is correct, given the lack of mature forests in the Mendocino County region, eliminating more than a very small number of the oldest second growth trees at Jackson would be a significant adverse impact both in and of itself and in combination with past and reasonably

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

foreseeable Timber Harvest Plans (THPs) on adjacent and nearby industrial timberland. THPs, state permits to log, are recognized as projects under the California Environmental Quality Act.

The old growth retention policy seems to indicate that some old growth trees will be cut if they are inconvenient for planned timber operations. Old growth trees are a non-renewable resource and their elimination for the sake of convenience is a significant adverse impact that is not identified as such in the DEIR. We recognize that occasionally a particular tree is such a hazard to human life as to potentially require removal. In the rare instance where this would be true, we recommend determining whether topping the tree to create a snag would eliminate the hazard instead. Only as a last resort should an old growth tree be removed. Every old growth tree should be granted a buffer from timber operations that might damage it, or better yet, aggregated with others nearby into a late succession development area.

Road rehabilitation is another concern. The preferred alternative appears to take a rather slow approach to fixing the many miles of admittedly substandard roads at Jackson. The Board should make sure that adequate funding is directed to maintenance of Jackson's resources, particularly road rehabilitation.

It would have been helpful if the DEIR was explicit about staffing at Jackson. The DEIR makes many promises about how the forest is to be managed, but there is no way to assess whether staffing at Jackson is adequate to implement the plan. For instance, it is our understanding that Jackson does not have a staff biologist. If this is still true, we believe it is highly likely that the goals and objectives of the FMP will not be properly implemented. Staffing needs should be discussed in the DEIR:

Conclusion

It is in the nature of reviewing a Draft Environmental Impact Report to focus on the negative. In spite of our remarks here, we wish to again recognize the managers of Jackson Demonstration State Forest for the effort that has been expended on putting together the new Forest Management Plan. It is clear that a lot of thought has gone into important aspects of the plan. The Board now has the opportunity to augment the draft EIR so mitigations are adopted that address the concerns raised by so many segments of the public. In conclusion, we urge the Board to continue your efforts by increasing your focus on demonstrating forest management that promotes the survival and recovery of species that depend on older forests, including salmonid species.

Sincerely,

Zeke Grader, Executive Director

Traci Thiele, Representative

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Associations Council	Humboldt Watershed
Tom Weseloh, Northern California Manager California Trout	Josh Israel, President Salmonid Restoration Federation
Stan Griffin, Northern CA President Trout Unlimited California	Alan Levine, Director Coast Action Group
Larry Evans, Executive Director Environmental Protection Information Center Center	Tim McKay, Director Northcoast Environmental
Larry Moss, Representative Smith River Alliance	

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-108

Response to Comment 1

The commenter accurately cites the California Fish and Game Code. However, Section 2053 goes on to state that: "Furthermore, it is the policy of this state and the intent of the Legislature that reasonable and prudent alternatives shall be developed by the department, together with the project proponent and the state lead agency, while at the same time maintaining the project purpose to the greatest extent possible." The Board of Forestry and Fire Protection finds that the DEIR, RDEIR, and associated mitigation and management measures are consistent with the Fish and Game Code Sections cited by the commenter as well as the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon within the Mendocino Coast Hydrologic Unit. The DEIR and RDEIR indicate that Alternatives C1 and G, respectively, will make a significant contribution to the recovery of listed salmonids. JDSF is managed to prevent take of listed species as well as to facilitate the recovery of aquatic habitat conditions to enhance the sustainability of salmonid populations.

Response to Comment 2

Although the precise language of the acknowledgement suggested by the commenter is not made, the regional context of the ownerships in which JDSF is located is amply described in Section V Environmental Setting (DEIR Page V-12-30) as well as DEIR Pages VII.6.1-37-53.

Response to Comment 3

Habitat protections provided listed and unlisted but declining species in the DFMP and ADFMP, including additional measures or mitigations identified in the DEIR and RDEIR, are based on the best available scientific information relative to the species of concern. The protections provided by the Forest Practice Rules had no bearing on the development of habitat management measures or mitigations developed beyond defining the floor below which forest management activities and consequent effects on habitat would not go. In other words, the needs of the species, as best as they could be determined with existing information, provided the basis for the DEIR, RDEIR, and associated mitigation and management measures and not the minimums defined by the Forest Practice Rules. Many examples could be cited of how Alternative G and the ADFMP, for example, goes well beyond the requirements of the Forest Practice Rules to provide protections for both aquatic and terrestrial species and their habitat:

- Additional management measure for large woody debris survey, recruitment, and placement;
- Management of Class I and II WLPZs for development of late seral forest characteristics;
- Management of one-third of the forest for older forest structure, late seral forest, or old-growth conditions;
- Substantial restrictions on the use of even-aged management;
- Adaptive Management and Monitoring Program.

The ADFMP provides for three Riparian Restoration Demonstration Areas, where CAL FIRE, other state and federal agencies, and researchers will have the opportunity to test the effectiveness of various approaches to aquatic resource protection, including NMFS' recommendations.

Response to Comment 4

References to the historical and current impacts of timber harvest relative to the listing status of salmonids and their habitat requirements are frequently cited in the DEIR Environmental Setting Section V-12-17 and more specifically on DEIR Page VII.6.1-1, VII.6.1.71 and Section VIII Cumulative Effects Page VII-65-89.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Response to Comment 5

The DEIR and RDEIR conducted a thorough cumulative effects assessment and concluded that habitat conditions for listed species are expected to continue to improve under either Alternative C1 or G.

Response to Comment 6

CDF believes that the 240 sq ft/acre of basal area retained in WLPZs is more than adequate to ensure a trend toward the development of late seral conditions. It is the intent of JDSF to promote late successional conditions. Management activities that could be considered counterproductive to that objective are not applied. The commenter provides no basis for consideration of an alternative basal area figure to support their position that attainment of late successional conditions are “highly unlikely”. Retention of a minimum of 240 sq. ft. /acre of basal area after a harvest entry that occurs once every 20 years will result in a forest stand that is older and larger with the associated forest structure complexities and accumulation of biomass associated with late successional conditions.

The WLPZ measures also represent minimum, programmatic standards, that are commonly adjusted based upon local conditions, but are never adjusted below the minimum standards specified in the ADFFMP (Chapter 3, Riparian, Wetland, and Floodplain Management). It is common practice on JDSF to leave Class I and II WLPZs uncut.

Response to Comment 7

The width of riparian zones will not prevent the development of desired late successional forest structural elements. Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones developed in the DEIR in addition to those management measures developed to contribute to the recovery of aquatic resources (DEIR Section 6.1.14 Pages VII.6.1-96-98) are expected to make a significant contribution to stream ecosystem processes (LWD recruitment, improvement in pool/riffle ratio etc). Attainment of the microclimate conditions described by the commenter is dependent on a variety of topographic and adjacent forest stand structure conditions. Minimum WLPZ width is determined by stream and slope class as described in the Forest practice Rules 916.5. Microclimate and stream shading effects of varying buffer width are detailed in the DEIR Pages VII.6.1-13-15.

Response to Comment 8

Comment noted. The National Marine Fisheries Service concerns related to the effectiveness of the Forest Practice Rules are addressed in the document: Resources Agency’s response to NMFS, California Forest Practice Rules July 10, 1998. The information provided to the Board by the NMFS in their December 3, 1999 correspondence clearly indicates that the NMFS was still “in the process” of developing forestry standards and guidelines. The guidelines provided were prepared to address a specific timberland owner and are intended to apply to circumstances where a timberland owner was interested in obtaining a two- to five-year short-term habitat conservation plan (HCP). These guidelines would not be used to supplant minimum forest practice rules nor were they to apply to any specific THP. NMFS cover letter goes on to state: “The guidelines that will be provided . . . will be generic and presented without regard to site specific information” and that the “measures . . . may be tailored site specifically depending on the availability of information and analysis.” It is later emphasized in the cover letter that “The NMFS is aware . . . that watershed analysis would be the most functional procedure to use when reviewing and approving THPs.”

The measures proposed in the DEIR and the RDEIR were developed following a thorough watershed assessment that thoroughly assessed the potential impacts to aquatic resources and water quality, based on the analysis of the conditions found on JDSF and in the surrounding areas. The assessments found that the ADFFMP, based on Alternative G, given the various management measures and mitigations applied, would not result in significant adverse impact to resources. The analysis in fact indicated the potential for a number of beneficial effects, including:

- decreasing water temperatures;
- large woody debris and its associated habitat values,
- riparian forest condition, extent, and ecological function;

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

- protection of streambank stability;
- improved in-stream habitat conditions;
- improved access to spawning and downstream migration.

See also response to Comment 3. It should be noted that the Board recently adopted regulations to enhance the protection of coho salmon in situations where DFG has determined that take is likely to occur as a result of timber harvesting operations. The Board is currently engaged in a scientific literature review to ensure the measures provided in the Forest Practice Rules are adequate for the protection and restoration of anadromous salmonid populations.

Response to Comment 9

Headwater stream ecosystems and their relationship to sediment transport, large wood recruitment and delivery are described in DEIR Pages VII.6.1-6-10

Response to Comment 10

Comment noted. See responses to Comment 3 and 8 above. Additional protections for Class III watercourses would depend on a variety of site specific factors and would be explained in the THP or the record of review of the THP.

Response to Comment 11

The riparian aquatic conservation strategy described for public lands in the document: Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Related Species within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (April 1994) is an **interim** strategy to be used until a watershed analysis can be conducted and more site specific standards and guidelines developed. CDF has completed the elements of a watershed analysis for the JDSF ownership and bases its management standards and guidelines on those findings. For example, the ADFFP and DEIR provide for late successional forest recruitment along watercourses; and the DEIR provides additional management measures for large woody debris recruitment (DEIR Page VII.6.1-96-98). The ADFFP, based on Alternative G, goes further than the DFMP did and designates one-third of the Forest for older forest structure, late seral forest, and old-growth forest conditions.

Attachment A (Page B-13) to the Record of Decision for the Standards and Guidelines cited by the commenter above states that: "Interim widths for Riparian Reserves necessary to meet Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives for different watersheds are established based on ecologic and geomorphic factors. These widths are designed to provide a high level of fish habitat and riparian protection until watershed and site analysis can be completed." "The prescribed widths of Riparian Reserves apply to all watersheds until watershed analysis is completed, a site-specific analysis is conducted and described, and the rationale for final Riparian Reserve boundaries is presented through the appropriate NEPA decision-making process."

Response to Comment 12

The DEIR and RDEIR analysis of available data and with incorporation of the Monitoring and Adaptive Management Section (DEIR Section 6.1.13 Page VII.6.1-94-96, ADFFP Chapter 5) and Additional Management Measures to Contribute to Recovery of Aquatic Resources (Section 6.1.14 DEIR Pages VII.6.1-96-98), as well as other protective measures added by Alternative G, supports the determination of a less than significant or less than significant with mitigation determination.

Response to Comment 13

See Response to Comment 11.

Response to Comment 14

See Responses to Comments 5 and 12.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Response to Comment 15

The distribution and extent of existing late-successional forest on JDSF and location of late-successional forest development areas are described in the DEIR and associated maps (e.g., Map Figure K in the DEIR shows vegetation by habitat classes, including classes indicative of conditions meeting some definitions of late seral forest; RDEIR Map Figure 2 identifies stands by the average numbers of trees per acre greater than 30 inches in diameter). Because age is not a useful parameter to identify late-successional forest for wildlife habitat classification purposes, information such as that presented in the latter maps is a better indicator of older forest conditions. Thus, the DEIR and RDEIR focus on forest structural attributes including tree diameter and percent canopy closure when assessing wildlife habitat related issues.

The late seral development areas established under various alternatives were designated primarily due to their relationship with other forest attributes. For example, the riparian zones are so designated, due to the widely recognized value of riparian zones as habitat and corridors for many species of wildlife, as well as their value to aquatic habitat and water quality. Other late seral development areas were designated to form larger patches of late seral forest adjacent to existing old-growth forest. The Mendocino Woodlands STA is designated due to a combination of factors, including proximity to state parks and the coast, as well as the fact that it represents a large contiguous patch of even-aged young forest that has not been significantly developed. The area designated for late seral development in the Russian Gulch/Lower Big River area is intended to provide future habitat suitable for Marbled Murrelets. It is widely recognized that forest stands tend to develop characteristics of old forest as they age, including the development of unique structural elements, such as snags, down logs, cavities, large limbs, and broken tops.

The late seral development areas have been identified as areas that will be managed to achieve late seral characteristics in the future. These areas currently are comprised primarily of second-growth forest that is not yet late seral in character. Selective harvest is proposed adjacent to most of these areas, but will not preclude the development of late seral characteristics within them. Habitat connectivity has been considered in detail within the wildlife analysis. There is very little forest within JDSF that is currently classified as old forest. The second-growth forest exists in large patches that are well connected throughout the forest by riparian zones.

Response to Comment 16

The short-term harvest schedule proposes to harvest in forest stands that do not meet the definition of late seral or late successional, based upon current information. If stands of late successional forest are found within future project areas, the potential impacts to species normally associated with this type of forest will be considered as the project is planned (Title 14 CCR 919.16). Other management limitations apply as well, including provision to retain old-growth trees, stands, and aggregations (ADFFMP Chapter 3, Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Species, Habitat, and Forest Structure). Existing, older second-growth stands that will contribute to the development of designated late successional forest conditions are managed consistent with the objective of attainment of late successional conditions. As noted earlier, Alternative G and the ADFFMP designate one-third of the Forest for older forest structure, late seral forest, and old-growth forest conditions.

Response to Comment 17

Old-growth trees per the old-growth retention policy are not removed for the "sake of convenience". An individual old-growth tree may be removed if it represents a forest worker or public safety issue or its retention would result in an equal or greater level of a planned projects environmental impact. The ecological value of individual old-growth trees is recognized and their removal is a "last resort." The frequency of individual old-growth tree occurrence and likelihood of attaining old-growth/late successional conditions were important variables in the identification of late successional development and existing old-growth stand augmentation areas. Individual old-growth trees are typically buffered with adjacent tree retention during project planning and layout. Extensive modeling and analysis was done for the Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat sections of the DEIR and RDEIR; this work resulted in conclusions that the ADFFMP, with various management measures and mitigations

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

applied, would not result in significant adverse impacts to older forest values, whether looking at individual or cumulative impacts.

Response to Comment 18

Alternative C1 and C2 both include the Accelerated Road Management Plan as described in the DEIR Section 6.1.14 Additional Measures to Contribute to Recovery of Aquatic Resources DEIR Pages VII.6.1-96-97. The ARMP completes an inventory of roads needing repair in 3 years instead of 5 and requires other THP level road upgrades. Alternative G and the ADFFMP also include the Accelerated Road Management Plan approach. The Board anticipates that an increase in the Department's authorized budget level for the Demonstration State Forests, resulting from the fiscal year 2006/07 Budget Act, will provide the Department with the resources it needs to implement the roads program. For example, a second heavy equipment operator recently was added to the Forest's staff.

Response to Comment 19

Depending on the Alternative selected and budget authorizations created through state budget processes, staffing levels could decrease, remain the same, or increase in response to need. See Response to Comment 18 regarding recent increases in budget authority for the Demonstration State Forests. JDSF has added a new Senior Wildlife Biologist in the past year and has upgraded the level of its Geographic Information System Specialist position.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-109

From: Patrick Emmert [pemmert@netptc.net]
Posted At: Monday, February 27, 2006 12:06 PM
Conversation: Jackson Demonstration State Forest
Subject: Jackson Demonstration State Forest

Attention George D. Gentry, Executive Officer
Attachment contains my comments on the DEIR

Thank you,
Patrick Emmert

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

PATRICK E. EMMERT - FORESTER
CALIFORNIA REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL FORESTER, NO. 1839

February 27, 2006

Mr. George D. Gentry
Executive Officer
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460
board.public.comments@fire.ca.gov

Dear Mr. Gentry,

I am writing in regards to *Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF) and the solicitation for comments on its Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)*.

I am writing in support of Alternative C1. I believe this alternative best serves the citizens of the State of California while protecting the environment of the 50,000 Demonstration State Forest. Alternative C1 facilitates natural resource scientists to test hypotheses and conduct demonstration projects that are designed to help broaden the common knowledge of forestry and general natural resource sciences.

I possess absolute trust in the JDSF personnel charged with the management of the Demonstration Forest and the protection of the natural resources. Timber harvesting should be conducted on a sustained schedule to perpetuate the forest setting and facilitate new growth. I believe the dynamics of the natural setting must be utilized for education, learning, and stimulation, as well as to insure for retention of aesthetic gratification that is derived from nature. The original purpose of JDSF is more valid today than in the past.

I completely endorse timber harvesting for economic benefits for the citizens of California and those individuals that derive their livelihood from related employment opportunities associated with JDSF projects. I endorse the recreation opportunities provided by JDSF and believe recreation should continue to a major emphasis on the forest management.

I also believe the forest should provide greater educational projects in the future. The citizens of California do not realize the multitude of benefits that are derived from active forest management of our natural resources.

I believe Alternative C1 will provide protection to all public trust resources and urge its adoption.

Sincerely,

Patrick Emmert

Post Office Box 535 Auberry, California 93602 (559) 855-8913 Fax (559) 855-4497

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-109

Response to Comment 1

Support of Alternative C1 and past management noted. The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products. Recreation and the demonstration that recreation is a compatible use of the forest remains an important management objective (see General Response 14). Integrating the recreation program with the education and demonstration program has great potential to increase public knowledge of the benefits derived from active forest management of our natural resources.

Increased emphasis on the use of JDSF as an educational tool is one of the goals of the ADFMP. The expansion of the Forest Learning Center is expected to augment the research and demonstration program by providing a place where the public can learn about forest ecology and management. It is also expected to attract greater numbers of scientists to do important research work on the forest. See General Response 2.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

E-110

Kraemer, Candace

From: Gary Brittner [brittner@sbcglobal.net]
Posted At: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 7:36 PM
Conversation: JDSF mgt plan
Subject: JDSF mgt plan

Gary Brittner, RPF 1891 - PO Box 467 - Meadow Vista, CA - 95722

February 7, 2006

Dear Board of Forestry,

I urge the Board to select Alternative C1 for the JDSF EIR and Management Plan. It's the only plan that makes sense given State law and policy. CDF has managed the forest well for decades. C-1 improves upon that dynamic model (alternative B). The Board needs to provide CDF practical policy for managing the state forests to fulfill the demonstration mission.

The demonstration value of this (and the other state forests) is invaluable in providing scientific and empirical information about forest, wildlife, and watershed methods for large and small landowners. Alternative C-1 is the most inclusive option. It provides the greatest latitude for scientists to conduct practical demonstration and research projects.

1 Alternative C-1 provides a plan that can help solve them most common and critical real world problems faced by forest landowners. Alternatives D-F are too narrow in scope and too risky to implement on a resource as important as JDSF. Private landowners and other resource managers need CDF to continue its management practices that provide real world answers to resource problems. Our state needs managed forests to perpetuate private property and public trust resources. We need to keep forests working and productive. Otherwise, landowners will convert the forests to other uses that are less environmentally-friendly and impair our quality of life.

JDSF is the largest publicly-owned working forest in the redwood region. It's the only place where large-scale research and demonstration can take place. Alternatives D-F are off course. They will shift the emphasis of management away from statutory mission and provide little practical benefit. Alternatives D-F restrict the value of JDSF research and demonstration to a tiny sliver of landowners and researchers.

2 JDSF provides great recreational opportunity and experiences as added benefit to normal operations. Emphasizing recreation is inconsistent with the law and policy. There are abundant recreation opportunities at State parks in the area. Also, recreation is incapable of replacing rural jobs and capital that would be lost if sustainable forestry is not used at JDSF. Alternative C1 provides payroll, local and state tax revenues, and local and regional stability. The same is not true for alternatives D-F.

In summary, select C-1. It's sustainable and practical. It protects wildlife and watersheds, provides recreation, and keeps forest resources and local and regional economies robust. I am a registered professional forester and have worked and recreated at JDSF. Personally and professionally, alternative C-1 makes the most sense. Other options are too narrow in scope and too risky for such an important resource.

Yours,

Gary Brittner
RPF #1891

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-110

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2. Support for Alternative C1 noted. The Board generally agrees with these comments. The Board recognizes the role of JDSF for research and educational purposes and the importance of flexibility in the management plan. The Board further recognizes the importance of maintaining a viable outdoor laboratory by managing the forest to create diverse stand and habitat types, including even-aged management areas. The intention is to retain the value of JDSF for research and demonstration that is relevant to a wide range of landowners and researchers.

The DEIR analysis determined that some elements of Alternatives A and D-F may be inconsistent with the current Public Resources Code, regulations, and Board policy that guides the management of JDSF. The Board has developed a management plan utilizing elements from several alternatives that strives to balance the concerns of all Californians while remaining consistent with the legislative mandate and Board policy for the state forest system. The ADFFMP is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 14.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Page 1 of 1

Kraemer, Candace

E-112

From: Danweldan@aol.com
Posted At: Tuesday, February 28, 2006 2:00 PM
Conversation: JDSF DEIS Comments
Subject: JDSF DEIS Comments

TO: George D. Gentry

Please find attached the FLC comments on the JDSF DEIS

Daniel M. Weldon
Executive Director
Forest Landowners of California
(916) 972-0273
(916) 979-7892 fax
dweldon@forestlandowners.org

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN



**Forest Landowners
OF CALIFORNIA**

3550 WATT AVENUE, SUITE 140
SACRAMENTO, CA 95821
(916) 972-0273
(916) 979-7892 FAX
E-mail: dweldon@forestlandowners.org

February 28, 2006

Mr. George G. Gentry
Executive Officer
California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
P.O. Box 944246, Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

RE: Jackson Demonstration State Forest DEIR

Dear Mr. Gentry,

The Forest Landowners of California (FLC) is submitting these comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF). The members of FLC are family forest owners from throughout the state who depend on the research and demonstration projects conducted at JDSF. In fact, PRC Section 4631(d) states that JDSF shall provide for the "Demonstration of economical forest management." In the five years since the management program at JDSF was halted by legal action, the pressure on private forestlands has intensified. The bottom line is we need Jackson back on track as soon as possible and operating at peak efficiency. The extremely detailed DEIR provides in depth analysis in a structure that is both understandable and authoritative.

In reviewing the alternatives for management, FLC recommends the approval of Alternative C-1, which provides the greatest flexibility for meeting the mandate for demonstration as well as the legislative purpose of maximum sustained production of high quality forest products while giving full consideration to recreation, watershed, wildlife, range and forage, fisheries, and aesthetic enjoyment. Option C-1 would provide the greatest benefits to the broadest range of citizens without resulting in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

The demonstration aspect of JDSF cannot be emphasized enough. As the DEIR states, "If the values of long-term forest management are not demonstrated to owners of small to mid-sized forest tracts, there is greater potential for these lands to be converted to other uses, and the economic, social and environmental impacts of expanding forest fragmentation could be magnified across the region."

FLC appreciates this opportunity to comment about the JDSF DEIR. We encourage the Board of Forestry to act swiftly to insure that JDSF returns to full management operations as soon as feasible for all concerned.

Sincerely,

Daniel M. Weldon
Executive Director

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Email Letter E-112

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2. Support of Alternative C1 and the completeness of the DEIR noted. The Board agrees that it would be highly beneficial for the State Forest to fully resume management activities, so the Board is working actively to complete the EIR process and approve a management plan based on RDEIR Alternative G. The Board has developed a management plan utilizing elements from several alternatives that strives to balance the concerns of all Californians while remaining consistent with the legislative mandate and Board policy for the state forest system. See also Response to Email Letter E-110.

The Board recognizes the problem of increased forest fragmentation and loss of productive timberland due to the economic pressures to convert the land to other uses. The Board recognizes the value of JDSF to reduce this trend, and its inherent environmental degradation, by providing demonstration of viable and sustainable forest management. The management plan will provide both a useful demonstration and valuable source of information to private timberland owners, providing an incentive to maintain their lands in timber production and other forms of active management.

FINAL EIR FOR JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Kraemer, Candace

E-113

From: dcalvert [dcalvert@mcn.org]
Posted At: Wednesday, March 01, 2006 11:25 AM
Conversation: March 1 Public Input re:Jackson Demonstration State Forest Management Plan
Subject: March 1 Public Input re:Jackson Demonstration State Forest Management Plan

March 1, 2006

Attention:
Mr. George Gentry
Executive Officer
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
P.O. Box 922426
Sacramento, CA 94224-2460

RE: Jackson Demonstration State Forest

I am a non-industrial timber landowner.

1 I find the ongoing controversy surrounding the management of Jackson Demonstration State Forest alarming. Some members of the public are attempting to change the original mandate yet again without offering any mitigation for the new impacts. Most of the proposed alternatives (D,E,F and A) will destroy over 50 years of work from constantly evolving forest laboratory experiments from which all parties have gained access to valuable data. I am particularly alarmed about the prohibition on clear cutting included in some of the alternatives. This harvest method needs to be included to experiment with controlling the spread of disease or experimenting with the harvest methods best suited to areas subject to severe wind conditions, to name just two threats to general forest health. Clear cuts already exist in nature due to wind fall (entire hillsides in remote areas of Alaska), volcano (St. Helens), meteor (Russia), and fire (Yellowstone).

3 Shifting the emphasis away from sustained yield production in JDSF means less product going to the mills. This results in more mill closures which means less competition for the products of the dwindling numbers of forest landowners. The loss of economic viability encourages more land fragmentation. While the resource land base does not appear to be shrinking on a casual perusal of the the TPZ zoning, close observation will reveal increasing numbers of parcels purchased to serve as "no cut zones" which actually serve as private preserves under advantageous property tax treatment for residential users. There are huge local impacts from the loss of good jobs that paid health benefits. The Mendocino Coast District Hospital is in severe financial distress. Interestingly, the troubles seem to have followed closely on the heels of the Fort Bragg Mill closure. Is there a connection between the disappearance of jobs with good health benefits and the hospital's woes? Similarly, local school enrollment is shrinking and there is competition between the districts for students...interdistrict transfers are becoming increasingly difficult to procure.

4 I would rank the proposed alternatives in the following order from best to worst in terms of maintaining a viable forest laboratory and the local economy:
B-- (1983 plan)
C1--This would have been my first choice had it not called for potential increase in recreational use.
C2--Not as acceptable as previous alternative.
D}These next 3 destroy the intent of the original mandate and hinder too many of the research

5/27/2006

4 } opportunities.
E}
F}
A--This destroys the educational value of the forest and delivers another mortal wound to the local economy.

5 } There are multiple park areas in Mendocino county for recreational use. We have only one demonstration forest. Please save it for its original mandate to serve primarily for research and demonstration purposes.

Thank you.

Karen A. Calvert
P.O. Box 70
Albion,
CA 95410-0070

Email Letter E-113

Response to Comment 1

See General Response 2. The Board recognizes the role of JDSF for research and educational purposes and the importance of flexibility in the management plan. The Board further recognizes the importance of maintaining a viable outdoor laboratory by managing the forest to create diverse stand and habitat types, including even-aged management areas.

Response to Comment 2

See General Response 10.

Response to Comment 3

A significant level of sustainable timber production will continue at JDSF. The economic setting and the economic impacts of various levels of harvest, in terms of estimated employment and local revenues, are discussed in section III.6.2 of the DEIR. The resumption of timber production is expected to have a positive economic impact in the region.

Response to Comment 4

Ranking of alternatives noted. The DEIR analysis determined that some elements of Alternatives A and D-F may be inconsistent with the current Public Resources Code, regulations, and Board policy that guides the management of JDSF. The Board has developed a management plan utilizing elements from several alternatives that strives to balance the concerns of all Californians while remaining consistent with the legislative mandate and Board policy for the state forest system. Refer to General Response 2. The ADFFMP is designed to balance demonstration and research, production of timber products, and the desires of the public, while improving the overall health and ecosystem function of the forest. As stated above, it stresses the importance of maintaining a viable outdoor laboratory by managing the forest to create diverse stand and habitat types, including even-aged management areas. The intention is to retain the value of JDSF for research and demonstration that is relevant to a wide range of landowners and researchers.

Response to Comment 5

The Board supports a balanced, multiple use concept that provides high levels of resource protection and sustained production of high quality timber products. See General Response 14.