

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2020 5:59:22 PM

First name: Theodore

Last name: Doll

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I object to the proposed Foothills Landscape project on two counts. First, it proposes Categorical Exclusions and other devices that would virtually eliminate all opportunity for public input on Forest Service treatments and plans for the foothills part of the forest. Secondly, many of the proposed treatments are predicated on increasing forest health, but forest health is not defined in the proposed action and EA. From reading the proposed action and EA it would appear that the Forest Service defines forest health as that condition that produces the most salable timber. A better (scientific) definition is offered by Kolb, Wagner and Covington (1995) in L. G. Eskew, comp. "Forest health through silviculture: proceedings of the 1995 National Silviculture Workshop." This source defines the term from an ecosystem-centered perspective, i.e. that forest health involves the maximization of "resilience, recurrence, persistence and biophysical processes which lead to sustainable ecological conditions." The proposed actions in the Foothills Landscape project are dramatically inconsistent and at odds with this definition and the goal of sustainable natural ecological conditions, and this is to the detriment of the forest and the U.S. public.