

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/8/2020 4:21:18 PM

First name: Jeff

Last name: Lonn

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I object to the proposed Custer-Gallatin National Forest Plan based on the following issues that I raised in my comments of 6/4/2019:

Issue #1: Wilderness--I supported recommending the maximum acreage for wilderness (Alt D; 711,425 acres), but the new plan proposes only 125,675 acres. Particularly disappointing is the reduction of the Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn WSA, which will severely limit habitat connectivity and create a wildlife migration barrier for animals moving north from Yellowstone National Park. With the ever-growing human population, why wouldn't you support maximum protection of the forest for wildlife, watersheds, and ecological health?

Issue #2: Backcountry areas-I supported minimizing this designation (Alt. D; 5,937 acres) because it offers no real protection over the current plan, allowing and promoting both non-motorized and motorized recreation and vegetation management (logging and road building). The new plan designates over 200,000 acres as Backcountry Areas, allowing business as usual to continue on the forest. Climate change and the exploding human population suggest that, while this may have seemed acceptable in 1970, it is a poor plan for 2020 and beyond. It is really no plan at all.

Issue #3: Recreation emphasis-This designation promotes both motorized and non-motorized recreation and allows forest management (logging and road building). There is no shortage of human recreational activities in the Bozeman-Greater Yellowstone area, so why create more? I suspect special interest groups pressured you into designating 224,000 acres as recreational areas over Alt D's 35,000 acres. Is the best use of unspoiled forest land now an amusement park? I think that national forests' most important functions in the future will be preservation of wildlife and wildlife habitat, carbon sequestration to slow climate change, and protection of clean water.

Issue #4: Suitable timber lands-Too much of the forest will be classified as suitable for timber production/harvest. Even those areas designated as "not suitable" can still be logged under the guise of fuel reduction, habitat improvement, or forest health. This indicates that the new plan is no plan at all: it merely continues business as usual, and even appears to increase timber harvest over current levels (as mandated by Washington D.C. bureaucrats and politicians). However, new science has found that logging emits much more carbon dioxide than any wildfire, that logging does great ecological harm both to the forests and the streams, and that logging does little or nothing to prevent or slow wildfires. The climate is mainly responsible for the severity of wildfires, yet your analysis states only that the impact CGNF will have on the global climate is minimal. OK, let's all go out and buy gas-guzzling monster trucks because individually they have a minimal impact on the global climate. Logical? Of course not.

Issue #5: Watershed health-This is one of the most important functions of our national forest system. The FEIS states "Alternative D will move toward watershed, aquatic, and riparian desired conditions faster than the other alternatives". Yet Alt D was not chosen, nor were any parts of it. Again, this demonstrates great shortsightedness, and a desire to just continue business as usual.