

June 22, 2019

**RE: My comments on the GMUG Forest Plan Revision Working Draft**

Dear Dear GMUG Forest Plan Revision Team,

I have the following comments related to the Working Draft of the GMUG Forest Plan Revision:

Overall, the plan provides very weak, and in some cases non-existent, direction for protection of important resources. More standards, i.e., mandatory limits on action, need to be in the plan.

Frustratingly, there is no land in Gunnison County recommended for wilderness in the Working Draft, and only 22,400 acres across the entire GMUG! I support new wilderness areas, including those in the Community Conservation Proposal and Gunnison Public Lands Initiative.

Voluntary guidelines for protecting Gunnison Sage-grouse are weak and need to be mandated standards, especially for protecting leks, or breeding grounds.

No timber harvest should be allowed in high-quality lynx habitat.

Guidelines for protecting big game (deer, elk, bighorn sheep) on birthing grounds and winter range need to be mandatory.

It appears that significantly more timber would be cut under this plan versus the 1991 amended plan. Not good!

The plan proposes to establish conservation watershed networks to protect watersheds and sensitive species like trout and boreal toad, but provides no detail on how these networks would be applied and maintained.

Sincerely,  
Mary Harte  
1180 Cragmont Ave  
Berkeley, CA 94708