

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/6/2016 12:00:00 AM

First name: Hugh

Last name: Bartleson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Hi, my name is Hugh Bartleson, I was invited to a Community of Interest Meeting a couple months ago in Colville for motorized recreation. When I entered the room I walked to some of the maps on display, and I immediately became so angry I could barely talk, and that pretty much dominated my thoughts that evening, and the way I felt ever since. The thing that struck me immediately was the use of the term PWA, Potential Wilderness Area, and that is in reference to areas that do not necessarily meet the requirements of the Wilderness Act of '64, whether it be for size, or noise, or light depravation, or any of those sorts of things. So what that told me was, is that the Forest Service is predisposed to recommending wilderness whether or not it meets the Wilderness Act of '64, or not. That really made me angry.

And the Forest Service is bound to serve the public, but they are clearly only serving a small fraction of the public, the preservationist lobby. They are completely ignoring their other responsibilities, which, among others, are the responsibilities to the communities to not create more economic hardship. There are multiple users of the forest that are being ignored, that would be mining, logging, grazing, motorized recreation, recreation in general. Nobody needs wilderness, but there are studies that show the presence -- or the creation of no wilderness adversely affects the economies of local communities, yet, we have all proposed actions, including more wilderness.

In my case I would -- I consider the whole process to be deeply flawed, and very much of an injustice, and the only -- instead of all proposed actions, including vast areas of wilderness, perhaps, one should include some recommended wilderness provided that wilderness meets the requirements of '64. Thank you.