

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/23/2016 7:00:00 AM

First name: Thomas

Last name: Darlymple

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Forest Revision Plan

Dear Amy, Kelly and the Forest Management Plan Revision team,

I'm greatly concerned that the recommendations set forth in the proposed management plan would only serve the needs of a few overly concerned individuals who likely don't use the forest in any capacity as it sits. Environmental concerns are not being addressed in a manner consistent with "The Resolution of 1780", a federal trust obligating the United States to extinguish their governmental jurisdiction and title to lands that achieve statehood. When a territory became a state under the Resolution of 1780 the Federal Government was obligated to give the land to the state. Violated when the 12 Western States were admitted into the Union. The Federal Lands Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) enacted in 1976 is a clear violation of the constitutionally correct Resolution of 1780 and should be considered null and void.

What happens when Washington gets back her land? Better management reduces fire hazard and creates jobs in forestry and related industries, forestry jobs and related industries begin to increase, the Federal Government is relieved of massive costs of management with no concomitant income. The Federal Government has consistently proved its inability to manage its forests. It tends to lose money where the state managed forests are proven money makers. Sanctioned timber sales and individual woodcutters are an excellent management tool to decrease fire danger, closing these areas to motorized travel would increase fire potential causing fires to create heat intolerable to species that benefit low heat fires such as pine trees that require a burn to germinate their seeds. Soils become sterilized and unusable by wildlife for decades. Hunters, also an excellent management tool would no longer have access to these areas causing over populations of some species. This could conceivably harm species that have been affected by other factors society has inflicted upon them. Farms that grow food for humans have allowed animals like deer, elk and geese to increase their populations to unsustainable numbers. It is up to us to manage these animals. While I perceive it to be a long shot for the Federal Government to give the State of Washington her lawfully owned lands, I vehemently oppose any further closure to our lands to motorized access.

I am a disabled veteran that would lose all abilities to use the forest for any recreational opportunities should these areas be designated wilderness. I am not able to walk more than a couple hundred meters at a time and no up or downhill. I have been a hunter since I passed the Hunter Safety requirements at age 12. I have enjoyed days in the forest picking berries, mushrooms, fishing for trout in pristine streams, hunting and enjoying the smell of the forest. I am still able hunt as the State of Washington has provided opportunity through its Disabled Hunter Program allowing me to use a vehicle to hunt from. A companion can be designated to assist me in my endeavors. A "Designated Wilderness" would only deprive myself, other Veterans, disabled individuals, all Americans and other individuals legally residing in the Republic of The United States of America of our constitutional right to use these lands. Thank you for considering my response.

Sincerely,

thomas g. dalrymple