

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/10/2020 12:24:14 AM

First name: Bill

Last name: Johnston

Organization:

Title:

Comments: *Allow for 60,000 acres of commercial timber harvesting; does that mean clear-cut? Whether or not, who decides what and where to cut? Would public funds be spent to allow private harvesters access to public timber?

*Conduct prescribed burning on 50,000 acres; I acknowledge that prescribed burns are at times the best option for forest management, but is 50,000 acres a goal or a limit, and if a limit, how is the goal determined? Seems acreage may be excessive -- and if acres are ignited to meet the number, not good management.

*Apply herbicide across up to 74,500 acres Are you kidding me? why apply herbicides that take out native plants and understory trees. What's the rationale here? Is this designed to make commercial harvests easier and more profitable>

*Reroute up to 111 miles of trails; what trails, and re-routed where? How can I have a rational response to this proposal without detailed information, which the Foothills Landscape Project proposes to withhold

*Build an undisclosed amount of "temporary" roads. Where? on the face of it this sounds terrible. The Forest Service already has miles of roads it cannot afford to maintain. Why build more roads, "temporary" roads," instead of maintaining established roads for public access unless to serve profits of private interest? And why should we spend public money to build roads to serve private industry profits? The Forest Service is a government agency that should be serving PUBLIC interests. Unless these roads are proven to be in the public interest (which includes environmental, as the public is entirely reliant on the environment), I must vehemently oppose this.