

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/19/2020 7:08:29 PM

First name: Jason

Last name: Glenn

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I find it very hard to support any one of the proposed alternatives. My inclination is to support alternative W with some exceptions.

I support the maximum acreage of new proposed wilderness of alternative W but also support the maximum number of miles of wild and scenic river designation of alternative Z.

I support using prescribed fire and use of natural fires over human "active management." I feel all too often human hubris in active management has had detrimental effects, such as the results we are now recognizing from just over a century of overzealous fire suppression.

I support allowing timber harvest in areas that have already been part of the timber base and do not support any significant increases in the allowable cut level. The modest increase in timber harvest of alternative Z would be most acceptable. The harvest levels proposed in alternatives W and X are unacceptable. Too often calculated maximum harvest levels are exaggerations of what the resource is capable of and result in over harvesting and resource damage.

I do not support any significant increases in motorized travel. Most National Forests have more than enough areas and trails open for motorized travel. As the popularity of all-terrain vehicles increases as does the technology, illegal off-road travel is becoming an ever-increasing problem for public lands all over the west. Opening more areas to motorized travel will only redouble the problem and challenges of land managers. I do not support any alternative that reduces the size or boundaries of inventoried roadless areas or wilderness study areas to allow motorized use, including winter use by snowmobiles.