

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/5/2016 4:31:21 PM

First name: David

Last name: McClure

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am the permittee of the Swan Lake Grazing allotment on the Colville National Forest. First of all, I question the need for a plan revision. The previous plan worked well and when there was a problem to be addressed, an amendment was issued to take care of it. Some of the language that is in the new plan's alternatives, seems to me is vague and could be interpreted in different ways. Some of those interpretations might not be the best for those of us who rely on this National forest for our livelihood or for the forest itself. Some of the management ideas, are put forth by people who don't live here and won't feel the consequences of those ideas. No more public land should be put into wilderness, period. This designation, limits the management tools that are needed to address issues that would come up to protect this forest. Two that pop into my mind instantly are noxious weeds and wildfire control. I have been to many meetings regarding CNF management issues, taking time out of my life that I should have been using on my cattle operation. It is sad to say, most of the input that myself and others was ignored or "not used". I can understand why there are not many other comments from our industry on this plan revision. Most of us are tired taking time out of our lives, going to meetings and writing comments just to see that decisions have already been made. Let the previous plan stand and do not use any of the proposed alternatives. No action would be the best action. If an issue comes up that needs to be addressed, amend it like you've done before. This would save a lot of time for everyone, on every side. There is no use spending years trying to decipher whatever "New" alternative that is chosen. Dave McClure