

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/26/2022 6:00:00 AM

First name: Laurinda W.

Last name: Porter

Organization:

Title:

Comments: 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: