

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/14/2018 4:00:00 AM

First name: Michelle

Last name: Ajamian

Organization:

Title:

Comments: [CAUTION: Suspicious Link]Wayne National Forest plan

PROCEED WITH CAUTION: This message triggered warnings of potentially malicious web content. Evaluate this email by considering whether you are expecting the message, along with inspection for suspicious links.

Questions: Spam.Abuse@wdc.usda.gov

Good morning-

I believe the 2006 Plan has been used and misused to justify continuing industrial extraction and other practices that are destructive to our Forest, air, water, climate, and communities' economic and public health, as decades of protest letters and legal efforts have detailed.

Isn't it mandated that The Wayne conduct outreach and invite and listen to all those who have weighed in with objections to the 2006 Forest Plan (the focus of this assessment phase)? Aren't you required to reach out to all who raised objections to post-2006 logging, burning, highway and ATV trail-building projects and to the opening of the Forest to deep-shale, high-volume horizontal drilling and fracturing?

The Wayne plan does not list any environmental groups among its partners. See the recommendation section of Heartwood's 2008 Economic Analysis on the plan's prioritization of logging, burning, and ATV at the expense of forest health, water and air purification, and low-impact recreation to the economic detriment of the American people and contrary to USFS's congressional mandate.

Isn't the team also required to rigorously consider all of the material submitted previously to both USFS and the BLM that is relevant to the current planning process? This includes all legal protests, peer-reviewed and other substantive research and reports, the voluminous comments, and more than one hundred thousand petition signatures delivered to USFS/BLM over past decades concerning on-going activities on and under our state's only National Forest.

Doesn't the NEPA mandate that the team must use up-to-date science, economic and cultural data, and meaningful input from the broad community to conduct rigorous evaluation of all activities to be considered for inclusion in the new Plan?

Such evaluation must consider the true economic, climate, air, water, ecosystem, and socio-cultural long-term and cumulative costs and benefits of all activities considered.

I'd appreciate a response to my concerns

Michelle Ajamian