Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/16/2020 7:48:29 PM
First name: Anon
Last name: Anon
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Rather than mentioning all of the specific actions in this plan that I disagree with, I'll mainly comment on the philosophical disconnect involved in using the word "restoration" to label this plan. At its core, a restoration plan should seek to return an area to its natural condition, and therefore remove as much human impact as possible. A plan that includes the removal of large diameter fire resilient trees does not qualify. Even more absurd is the idea of opening the area to ATV access...please explain how this coordinates with the goal of restoration. I cannot request strongly enough that any plan of action moving forward involves a thorough review of potential ecological impact, and adheres to the best science regarding forest restoration practices. Under no circumstances should increased ATV access be a component of any plan. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.