

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/9/2019 12:20:47 PM

First name: Darren

Last name: Dunlop

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I have to honestly say I hear a lot of talking out both sides of the mouth in that meeting above all though is how can there be any true conversation if you cant give a better scope of how much it will cost? Was the meeting just a dog and pony show? All except the road closures I think the habitat improvements are all good things if they can be done for a very grounded cost, but if we're talking about hundreds of millions of dollars my answer is hell no - for the reason you gave, why spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a project that only effects 1% of the habitat of the forest. If you're going to use the relatively small scale to minimize the invasive impact of the work to be done then you have to also use the same scale to justify the expense. If you're talking hundreds of millions of dollars to improve 1% of the forest, that's a fools errand when there are so many good productive projects that could be done. The road closures are a joke, the national forest decommissioned those roads generations ago because they already don't maintain them, haven't in decades, you don't spend a penny on them, a few kids playing in the creek, building bridges or moving rocks looking for salamanders causes more erosion than a truck driving straight through a ford. People love those roads, you already abandoned them decades ago, all you're talking about is putting up tank traps to stop people from enjoying the forest which is really what this whole campaign is all about. I'd like to see more fields and some of the dead wood gone but not if it means spending hundreds of millions of dollars of our hard earned money and you closing more of the roads we use.