

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/3/2019 7:01:05 PM

First name: Kevin

Last name: Hedzik

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I have had the pleasure to spend a good amount of time in the Daniel Boone National forest over the last 15-20 years. Watching the Sun rise from Natural Bridge is something to behold. Our national forest lands are truly a wonder that all should be able to take part in. I wanted to write and voice my thoughts on Forest Plan Amendment #53386. I was able to attend the most recent meeting via Facebook live. Thanks for having a way for those of us who are not able to make meetings in person attend and hear what is going on.

I along with some others had questions during that meeting on the proposed changes, as they seem too broad and lack transparency. This was supposed to be a meeting to address questions, about how the proposed changes would impact the overall forest. However, when the board was asked about possible impact on recreation, to include how OHV use might be impacted, the board said that no one from that department was present as they didn't plan to cover that. It just does not sit well with me, that during the process for a major forest plan change those in charge didn't take into account that one of the largest user groups, humans, of the forest might like to know how the proposed changes could impact their use of the said forest. If those in charge can't even figure out that a meeting of this nature should have included a group who could answer human impact questions, then that to me means the entire plan is suspect.

In regards to bat exclusion zones/buffers. The question was asked is there an overlay of the proposed zones related to trails and OHV trails. The answer was the Forest Service could probably do an overlay to see. Again, why would you have not this type of information on hand from the get go? These are basic things that should have been thought out planned for and anticipated.

Case in point, the map of the forest that was included as part of the EA does not show enough details as to exact locations related to roads, towns and other features. I had to go on line and try to figure what buffer zone might be over what area. Again, we the forest users are left to wonder where exactly these large blobs of color showing this or that really encompass. With no reference points it is very hard to make any educated determination of how the proposed buffer zones will truly impact those who use the forest. Again, is this just poor planning or way to get this in acted without having to inform the public of what will be off limits to them in detail.

Conclusion:

Therefore I would not be in favor of the proposed changes because the generic terminology, lack of exact location materials and wide geographic areas impacted will adversely affect the human environment. This could lead to roads and trails being closed which inhibits our access of the forest not to mention the ability to fight or escape from forest fires. I also request whenever the USFS wants to take an action to include but not limited to closure, buffer zones or restricted access of an area, that it be handled through the proposed action process so a public comment period occurs to avoid agency over-reach and steer the action to a balanced solution.

Thank you for your time and consideration.