

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/7/2020 1:57:50 PM

First name: Brent

Last name: Martin

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear Supervisor Jewell -

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Foothills project. The enormity of the area covered in this project is the first troubling aspect. I'm not sure how the FS can assume to know anything at this scale. Climate change will and is effecting the landscape on a continuously evolving range of impacts and while I understand your desire to manage such an area within one set of parameters for simplicity and efficiency, is this really what is best for the public or the land? For example, given what we know regarding the ecological impacts of roads, to even consider temporary roads for "ecological restoration" is highly questionable. I don't think the FS has a crystal ball, and to move forward with such enormous assumptions at the landscape scale is both backward thinking and perhaps dangerous.

Specifically, if the FS is going forward with such an unprecedented level of carte blanche management:

All actions should be peer reviewed by an outside group of the scientific community

No herbicides -

No new roads, permanent or temporary

No actions in roadless areas

Full collaboration and consensus with the conservation and recreation communities on specific actions

Impacts to recreation should be considered as a priority

No action in old growth or potential old growth forest

Best available science should inform all actions

The State DNR and the Nature Conservancy should be given no more credit or influence than anyone else from the scientific or conservation community. They have way too much influence already. They always have.

Consider all actions within the most conservative of assumptions. Believe it or not, you really don't know the long term effects of your actions.