Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/16/2021 11:00:00 AM
First name: Dan
Last name: Anderson
Organization:
Title:
Comments: The way these directives are presented leaves one not knowing what or how to interpret the information that is presented as things are not organized in a specific area and have a tendency to contradict each other. If this were directions to build a bookshelf it would never hold a book let alone stand. It's as if there were 4 to 6 committees working on this project and they never cross referenced with each other and just put it into a document. For instance in a webinar, it was explained that the definition of a Grazing Agreement was in chapter 10, and further on in chapter 10, and then explained further on in chapter 10. Also the definition was explained in chapter 20, and then further explained in chapter 20, etc.

The zero code reads like a history book and personal opinions. The acts or laws not pertinent and opinions not proven in court that DO NOT apply to grazing should not be included. If the Forest Service needs a history book that is what they should write (and make it accurate) and not put it into directives.

In Chapter 20 there are various Grazing Agreements listed as exhibits, however there is no place where it explains what act or law these Agreements are derived from. This leaves a lot of confusion and possible misinterpretation to this section. The lands that the Bankhead Jones act covers should only have ONE Grazing Agreement that is standard with each state/associations. Laws or nuances that only affect those with in a state or area can be added to their grazing agreement. A Grazing Agreement is not a type of term permit by the agencies definition of a term permit. There should be separate directives for a Grazing Agreement on LUP lands because the LUP lands are take lands. Chapter 20 is very poorly written and DOES NOT give justice to the Bankhead Jones Act.

In Chapter 50 questions for clarity: Is the federal lands that the grazing treaties refer to apply only to the reservation boundaries? How does that apply to lands that have a patent on them or take lands, ie Bankhead Jones land?

In conclusion I would suggest that this be sent back to a group that is open minded and not agenda driven so it is understandable by all that are to use it. Even Agency personnel have commented they cannot understand how to us it in its present form. It is questionable to me whether legal council was involved in drafting this document. The Agency should do a rule making on LUP lands that was never done when the FS took those lands over. It was stated that this document took into consideration the acts and laws that apply to specific lands but it is very difficult to get that out of this document. If Congress wanted all of these lands treated the same they would have amended the first act to include the newly acquired lands. They purposely DID NOT due to the fact they thought the lands needed to be handled differently.

The way these directives are presented leaves one not knowing what or how to interpret the information that is presented as things are not organized in a specific area and have a tendency to contradict each other. If this were directions to build a bookshelf it would never hold a book let alone stand. It's as if there were 4 to 6 committees working on this project and they never cross referenced with each other and just put it into a document. For instance in a webinar, it was explained that the definition of a Grazing Agreement was in chapter 10, and further on in chapter 10, and then explained further on in chapter 10. Also the definition was explained in chapter 20, and then further explained in chapter 20, etc.

The zero code reads like a history book and personal opinions. The acts or laws not pertinent and opinions not proven in court that DO NOT apply to grazing should not be included. If the Forest Service needs a history book that is what they should write (and make it accurate) and not put it into directives.

In Chapter 20 there are various Grazing Agreements listed as exhibits, however there is no place where it explains what act or law these Agreements are derived from. This leaves a lot of confusion and possible misinterpretation to this section. The lands that the Bankhead Jones act covers should only have ONE Grazing Agreement that is standard with each state/associations. Laws or nuances that only affect those with in a state or area can be added to their grazing agreement. A Grazing Agreement is not a type of term permit by the agencies definition of a term permit. There should be separate directives for a Grazing Agreement on LUP lands because the LUP lands are take lands. Chapter 20 is very poorly written and DOES NOT give justice to the Bankhead Jones Act.

In Chapter 50 questions for clarity: Is the federal lands that the grazing treaties refer to apply only to the reservation boundaries? How does that apply to lands that have a patent on them or take lands, ie Bankhead Jones land?

In conclusion I would suggest that this be sent back to a group that is open minded and not agenda driven so it is understandable by all that are to use it. Even Agency personnel have commented they cannot understand how to us it in its present form. It is questionable to me whether legal council was involved in drafting this document. The Agency should do a rule making on LUP lands that was never done when the FS took those lands over. It was stated that this document took into consideration the acts and laws that apply to specific lands but it is very difficult to get that out of this document. If Congress wanted all of these lands treated the same they would have amended the first act to include the newly acquired lands. They purposely DID NOT due to the fact they thought the lands needed to be handled differently.