

Appendix D
The Dalles Watershed Fuelbreak Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project
Potential Issues from the Public Received During Scoping

Comments Received	Significant Issue? Yes/No	If no- How was it addressed? If yes- Create issue statement
<p>By eliminating the cover along these open roads, it would increase the likelihood that wildlife will be negatively impacted due to the harassment of motorized vehicles and people (ODFW, Email 11/28/06).</p> <p>If not done correctly, the fuelbreak could result in opening up too much forest around roads...it would enable increased poaching along the roads with no cover for big game species (OregonWild, Email 1/19/07).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Statement: There is a concern that creating and maintaining the fuelbreak by reducing the canopy cover along perimeter roads in the watershed may increase the risk of poaching of deer and elk.</p> <p>The effects of increased poaching were disclosed in the wildlife section. A meeting was held on February 14, 2007 to discuss this issue with Keith Kohl, ODFW and Erik Fernandez, OregonWild.</p>
<p>I do not support any vegetative removal along USFS Rd. 1700662 until the USFS addresses the road closures that were to have taken place in response to the timber sales that occurred in the early 90s (ODFW, Email 11/28/06).</p> <p>We recommend including the decommissioning of some roads in the project area, ideally utilizing already completed NEPA on which roads are recommended for road decommissioning. Retained receipts with a clear intent for closing roads may be applicable if necessary. There are too many roads to maintain, and they are detrimental to water quality and aquatic species (OregonWild, Email 1/19/07)</p>	<p>No. This issue is outside the scope of the proposed action.</p>	<p>The responsible official has decided that all road closures or road decommissioning will be analyzed as part of the North Fork Mill Creek planning area to occur in spring of 2007. A meeting was held on February 14, 2007 to discuss this with Keith Kohl from ODFW and Erik Fernandez from OregonWild.</p>

Appendix D

Comments Received	Significant Issue? Yes/No	If no- How was it addressed? If yes- Create issue statement
<p>It looks good to me after a quick read (Jim Denton, Email 11/21/06)</p>	<p>No. The issue is just a comment, opinion, or position statement.</p>	<p>A supportive comment that raised no concern with the proposed action so it was not addressed further.</p>
<p>The definition used for “fuels”...could include just about anything... includ[ing] mature and old-growth trees. It is very important for us to support this project that the type of fuels that will be targeted be explicitly described, not left vague...A diameter limit would be helpful here (OregonWild, Email 1/19/07).</p>	<p>No. This issue is addressed through the design features of the proposed action and effects analysis.</p>	<p>This concern is addressed in the detailed description of the proposed action. Mature or old-growth trees are not the emphasis for fuel reduction, though some may be removed or girdled if they would contribute to the decline of the health of the residual trees or regeneration. The project focuses on thinning from below to reduce fuels that may encourage a crown fire. Clarification was added to the description of “fuels” in the EA.</p>
<p>The fuelbreak along perimeter roads for The Dalles Municipal Watersheds is a good idea and should be implemented as soon as possible. I support the proposal (Ron Graves, Letter 12/16/06).</p>	<p>No. The issue is just a comment, opinion, or position statement.</p>	<p>A supportive comment that raised no concern with the proposed action so it was not addressed further.</p>
<p>We do not support the use of temporary roads for this project (OregonWild, Email 1/19/07)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Although OregonWild didn’t express their rationale for not supporting the use of temporary roads, we know there is concern that temporary roads will become permanent roads and cause resource damage.</p> <p>Statement: There is a concern that creating temporary roads may lead to resource damage, especially if these roads are not successfully obliterated upon completion of the project.</p> <p>The IDT spent time discussing what temporary roads in the planning area would look like and how they would be effectively obliterated. The effects of temporary roads were disclosed in the EA. A meeting was held on February</p>

Appendix D

Comments Received	Significant Issue? Yes/No	If no- How was it addressed? If yes- Create issue statement
		14, 2007 to discuss this issue with Keith Kohl, ODFW and Erik Fernandez, OregonWild.
We recommend that in pockets of root disease, keep the largest and best trees left...we do not support clear cutting of plantations just because they have root disease. We recommend variable density thinning the entire stand and having small patch openings where root disease pockets exist. These areas would be planted with resistant species (OregonWild, Email 1/19/07).	No. This issue is addressed through the design features of the proposed action and effects analysis.	These concerns are addressed in the detailed description of the proposed action in the EA. Variable density thinning with pockets of skips and gaps is what is proposed for the stands with root disease.
We ask that special care be taken to ensure minimal disturbance to recreational trails and to protect access to that area. Also, we request that you take as much care as possible to protect the viewshed. We are particularly concerned with scenic protection around Shellrock Mountain and Gibson Prairie (Mazamas, Letter 1/8/07).	No. This issue is addressed through the design features of the proposed action and effects analysis.	These concerns are addressed in the detailed description of the proposed action in the EA. The effects analysis discloses that the proposed action will not degrade visual quality and all visual quality objectives are being met. Mitigations were included to avoid disturbance to recreational trails.
I remain wholeheartedly supportive of this proposed project and anywhere else fuel reduction would be proposed along travel routes (Art Carroll, Letter 1/23/07).	No. The issue is just a comment, opinion, or position statement.	A supportive comment that raised no concern with the proposed action so it was not addressed further.
A fuel reduction standard [amending your Forest Plan] should also be done in a way that fuelwood permits could be used [for] this just objective of fuel hazard reduction and promote forest health as well (Art Carroll, Letter 1/23/07).	No. This issue is outside the scope of the proposed action.	No Forest Plan amendments were deemed necessary for this proposed project. Fuels reduction and applicable standards and guidelines may be examined further in the Mt. Hood National Forest, Forest Plan revision process.