

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/6/2019 11:26:37 PM

First name: Jerry

Last name: DiMarco

Organization:

Title:

Comments: In the DRFP, pg 83, 2.4.7 Special Forest and Botanical Products: collecting should be sustainable in all areas where it occurs. How will this be monitored? It appears that collecting of animals, animal parts, rocks, water, and soil are not regulated. I'm not sure what is meant by animal and water collecting, but would like to know. Rock and soil collecting appear to be unsustainable at any level. In upper Tom Miner Basin, there used to be "tons of petrified wood all over the ground", as told by many people I've known in the past. As long as a decade ago on a family camping trip, we hiked up there to look (only) for petrified wood. Not only did we find none, the entire area looked like it had been picked over, in other words trampled and barren of ground cover and debris one would expect to see in high places. A resource is gone forever. I'm sure similar things are happening in other places (agates, etc). This is not sustainable. More must be done to protect irreplaceable resources. There needs to be direction for everything that is collected on public lands.

Use of FS resources for biomass should not be allowed since it would be a contributor to climate change. I would also urge restraint in support of renewable energy. The beauty of renewable energy technologies, and the reason they were developed, is that they can be applied locally. In other words, renewable energy solutions are best applied on your building, or on your block, or in the neighborhood, or adjacent to cities and towns. This eliminates the need to expand the grid. Perhaps to the DCs for renewables you could add that projects will be considered only where they are adjacent to a community.

Glad to see intermittent streams and springs are included in riparian mgmt. zones. Saw only 1 mention of fish stocking. Given the emphasis on sustainability, one would expect to see a suitability requirement about not stocking fish in historically fishless waters. This goes against the 2012 Planning Rule section on ecosystem sustainability. Shouldn't this be in the Plan?

Soil productivity is mentioned a lot in the plan, but I didn't see much in the way of plan components. There is a need to recognize the effect of timber harvest on soil productivity. The natural process that works best for keeping soils productive is to leave the trees where they are so they can provide nutrients for the next generation of trees. This should be acknowledged in the Plan since it is the only way we're going to have sustainable forests.

Also glad to see caves are being protected. I've known some cavers and heard some stories. Apparently the use of explosives in caves is not uncommon. Perhaps there should be an additional standard prohibiting the use of explosives in caves. While on the topic, the recreational use of explosives is extremely annoying and dangerous. This is another use that should be prohibited. It makes no sense to prohibit fireworks but allow explosives. Especially now that climate change is increasing the risk of fires, explosives seem like a monstrously bad idea. Was glad when target shooting was limited, would be nice if it was moved off public lands as well. Now it's time to stop the use of explosives on our public lands.

The Forest Service needs to take a firmer stance against development in the wildland-urban interface, perhaps working with local gov'ts to discourage sprawl. At the very least, those who develop in inappropriate areas should foot the bill for any FS fire mitigation services. The FS should also partner with FEMA to use LWCF funds buy out burned private structures and properties, and take over mgmt. of those parcels.

Recreation residences should be phased out. Public land mgmt. agencies should not be catering to small groups. They should be providing services/benefits open to all of us. Recreation residences are special privileges offered to a limited group of people. They give the appearance that only certain people are allowed to do that. Our public land mgrs should not be involved in that sort of arrangement. In addition it looks too much

like privatization, and just encourages others to try more privatization. This use should be phased out. Our public lands are for all to enjoy, no one should get special privileges.

Likewise, resorts should be phased out. They also look too much like privatization. They can relocate outside the FS boundary. There should be another requirement for organizational camps, stipulating that they are suitable only in REAs. The crowds they draw make that an appropriate and sensible choice.

Regarding ski areas, the word "resort" is used. I hope this does not imply hotels, restaurants and other overnight amenities. If it just means a ski area, this should be included in the DC language. Totally agree that the summer activities listed should be kept within the ski area boundaries, no exceptions. In other words, delete, "unless existing ski areas cannot be expanded to accommodate additional use."

I saw no Objectives for land acquisitions, trades, consolidations and inholdings. I hope this is just an oversight.

I'm in agreement that there is a need to deal with overcrowding at recreation hot spots. However, I don't think simply enlarging existing areas is the answer. It makes more sense to limit REAs to places with paved roads. This not only handles the impacts better, it also tells people to expect crowds, so they are prepared for that. Perhaps the crowding problem could be helped by gaining access to more of the 21% of FS lands currently inaccessible.

I saw no guidance regarding pets. Are you aware of the dog walking problem on the Sourdough Canyon trail? This is one of our public water supplies. There is no way that water is clean anymore. Something needs to be done about people not having their pets on leashes and not cleaning up after them. There should be some objectives for control of damage to trail and water resources from pets.

Rather than having language (DRFP, pg 102, GO 01) encouraging "private and public partnerships, such as, contractors, concessionaires, private sector and volunteers to provide capacity", I would encourage you to include, with all plans, estimates of additional staff and resources necessary to provide the needed capacity yourselves. That way, we would be informed of your needs and could lobby on your behalf.

Regarding outfitters (DRFP, pg 114, DC 13 and pg 130, DC 05), I would feel better if there is additional language which states that the "identified public need" is reasonable and compatible with the ROS or area mgmt.

As a person who spends more time off trail than on, the practice of trapping worries me. It appears that trapping is still an allowed use. It also appears to be unregulated. I think given the number of off trail hikers, there should be some regulations that prevent hikers from accidentally getting snared. Traps should be marked in some permanently obvious way that is visible from all directions.

Regarding dispersed recreation (DRFP, pg 103, GO 01), specifically climbing, there is no organization that represents the climbing community. Climbers are notoriously independent. Therefore, when considering climbing regulations, especially bolting and other permanent installations (such as the charcoal grill on top of Gallatin Tower), I hope you will make an effort to reach out to the entire climbing community to solicit their input. There are some serious issues within the climbing community regarding damage to the resource. This includes not only damage to the rock via bolting, anchors and the like, but also adverse effects to the climbing experience, which includes the ability to learn how to climb, practice route finding skills and learn good judgement (the most important thing!). There are conversations climbers need to have to prevent the deterioration of the climbing experience and resource. Please let all of us be involved.

Typo in DEIS, pg 795, 2nd para, incomplete sentence.