

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/16/2020 10:22:55 PM

First name: Molly

Last name: Stowers

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Draft Revised Forest Plan

I'm currently operating on forest grazing allotments and would like to make a few comments/suggestions in regard to the livestock grazing portion of the proposed changes to the forest plan. I feel grazing livestock on the forest plays a key role and if done correctly, the benefits are huge to the environment. However, we must work together to obtain the best outcome and learn from each other to meet the goals of the forest. Quite often with the forest service the intent and guidelines end up canceling common sense out of the equation.

FW-GDL-GRZ-03

When stating that upland forage utilization must not exceed 45%, I believe considerations must be site-specific as to each individual allotment in the management plan. It must have key areas of representation without outside influences other than the livestock on that specific allotment. This is totally not thought out to throw a specific number such as 45% without any accounting for other influences.

FW-STD-ARGR-01

This paragraph is, in my mind, the most threatening to livestock in the whole forest plan. I believe it to be written or edited by someone who is looking for any excuse possible to remove livestock from the national forest. My first objection is the statement "adverse effects to fish and riparian habitat that may result from grazing practices." Practically anyone can blame livestock for anything here. What is the definition or limitation of this statement? Once again outside influences must also be considered. The very next sentence, the word "retard" is used. This word, in my mind, needs to be removed. It creates many different understandings or interpretations. I believe you mean to slow down the attainment of desired conditions. If that's the case just say it instead of using a word such as retard which is open to a wide difference of definitions.

FW-GDL-ARGR-01

In this paragraph, I believe that wildlife impact is totally forgotten and we must back up and look at this. For example, if elk move into a creek bottom and spend any amount of time, they will eat the green line down, possibly before cattle ever get there. Therefore cattle will have to be moved even though the elk have done the damage. The cattle, according to your guidelines, will need to be moved regardless of the remaining available feed. Is this your intent?

FW-GDL-ARGR-04

I agree we need to do whatever we feasibly can to protect our endangered species. However, this is attempting to put into effect to protect all native species also. We or you should not be required or responsible for protecting species not on the endangered species list, many of which no-one knows anything about. We don't know where they lay their eggs, or when. We don't know life cycle or for that matter if they are even present. Now you are wanting to tell everyone there is a problem. This makes us very very vulnerable. This alone could create huge litigation issues. The Forest Service would be required to prove that there is an existing problem and I don't believe you can.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your forest plan. Good luck on your changes. Please take my comments into consideration. Sincerely,

Ray Stowers

I attempted to submit these comments through the Facebook link, but it repeatedly rejected them.