## Daugherty, Sara -FS

From:	Neils, Chandra -FS
Sent:	Wednesday, October 26, 2022 11:28 AM
То:	Daugherty, Sara -FS
Subject:	FW: [External Email]Comment on South Otter Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project #58396

Sara,

Please see the comment that came in through Dan (previous team leader). We need to check out PALS and see if he is still listed. Thanks,



From: Pliley, Daniel - FS <Daniel.Pliley@usda.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2022 10:24 AM
To: Neils, Chandra -FS <chandra.neils@usda.gov>
Subject: FW: [External Email]Comment on South Otter Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project #58396

Hi Chandra,

Hope all is well! I hear you are detailing in Katie's position. Not sure what the structure of the teams looks like anymore so passing this comment email over to you. This is the only comment I have received so not sure if it directs them to me through PALS or if I am still listed as the contact elsewhere? I haven't been in PALS for probably a year but if I need to adjust something I can get in there and take a look.

Thanks,

Dan



Dan Pliley District Ranger Forest Service Bitterroot National Forest West Fork Ranger District p: 406-821-1212 c: 406-493-5256 daniel.pliley@usda.gov

6735 West Fork Road



-----Original Message-----

From: PORTER, LAURINDA W. <<u>rporter@rea-alp.com</u>> Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2022 11:09 AM To: Pliley, Daniel - FS <<u>Daniel.Pliley@usda.gov</u>> Subject: [External Email]Comment on South Otter Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project #58396

[External Email]

If this message comes from an unexpected sender or references a vague/unexpected topic; Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

Please send any concerns or suspicious messages to: Spam.Abuse@usda.gov

Dear Mr. Pliley,

I wish to comment on the above-referenced proposed project, and to support Alternative 1 (No Action) and oppose Alternative 2 (Proposed Action).

My reasons are threefold.

First, the Environmental Assessment (EA) presented information on the enormous scope of this project. More than half of the project's

318,800 acres would be burned, commercially thinned, or non-commercially thinned. The EA went on to suggest that all these activities would have virtually NO effects on the wildlife, the ecosystem, the uses of the National Forest by recreationists, and the views of the area. That conclusion seems ludicrous and unfounded.

Second, the purposes of the project apparently are designed to benefit the 28 grazing leaseholders who currently use the National Forest lands, not the public: