

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/16/2020 12:31:53 AM

First name: Hanna

Last name: Steadman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The implementation of either Alternative 2 or Alternative 3 would be a mistake. No action should be taken.

The forest service has a difficult enough time as is keeping up with the road conditions. Passing this 4FRI Project and dedicating time and resources to decommission up to 800 miles of unauthorized roads would greatly impact the upkeep on the current road ways. Currently, a mere 12% of roads in these three forests combined are suitable for passenger vehicles or better. Instead the forest service should dedicate the resources to increasing this percentage of roads suitable for passenger vehicles rather than spending unnecessary time and money on closing roads that aren't hurting anything.

Taking away an additional 200 miles of roadway for reasons such as protecting cultural resources, soil/water resource damage and ongoing road maintenance challenges is absurd. This is a cop out for the forest service to do less work and be required to maintain fewer roads while taking them away from the tax payers who own this land. How is a protective barrier in any way "natural"?

As far as tackling the mistletoe infection that has spread across the trees, the solution is to hire local loggers or the forest service to mechanically thin these areas. This would avoid the risk of having a controlled burn get out of hand and also avoid the potential of making the area unusable to the public afterwards due to being deemed "unsafe" in the burn areas. The initiative to address the mistletoe infection, however, does not need to be coupled with an "Alternative" that will shut down roads that should be open to the public.