Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/16/2021 5:14:22 PM
First name: jill
Last name: greer
Organization:
Title:
Comments:
The Rangeland Management Directives are very likely to significantly affect millions of acres of our shared public lands, of which key portions are actually Wilderness. Obviously any place where we should prohibit livestock grazing would be the true wilderness designation, since the language of the very Wilderness Act staes clearly and unequivocally that Wilderness shall remain "untrammeled." I grew up on a beef farm, and I have also raised sheep myself in recent years. I can personally attest that domesticate livestock do not graze and behave in the manner of native wild herbivores. Sheep in particular are notoriously detrimental to delicate native grasslands, and cause harm that is nearly irreparable. They also are the source of parasites and other infectious diseases that could further endanger the native mammalian population.
Because of these well-established facts about livestock grazing, the scientific community agrees that the millions of acres of our National Forests' treasured and legally protected Wilderness should NOT be subjected to this unnecessary degradation. All the potential negative impacts from grazing absolutely have to be considered, and spelled out on paper, via the proper public process that complies with federal laws and the need for transparency. That set of federal legal provisions most certainly must include the National Environmental Policy Act.

The future is to phase out these grazing permits, NOT to increase them! Therefore, the only revisions to Forest Service grazing policies necessarily should be oriented to getting VOLUNTARY retirement of these grazing permits, and thus reduce the total number of foreign species which are present in these delicate natural ecosystems. This 'pivot' in policy would much more fully represent the intended duty of the Forest Service's charter from the American people who pay for their salaries, namely encourage and prioritize voluntary grazing permit retirement to reduce permitted livestock grazing across the National Forest system, including within Wilderness, in orderto protect Wilderness, other public lands, and wildlife.

The Forest Service simply cannot in good conscience ever allow the grazing to those 1960s excessive levels. Even the current grazing levels are too much, and that reality must be acknowledged. conditions oftentimes cannot support increased, or even current, grazing levels.

The Forest Service truly needs to develop the kinds of management plans that keep the public federal agency IN CONTROL, with full authority to make key decisions, and to have the power to restrain the potential excesses of those holding the grazing permits. (The ridiculous armed standoff with the renegade family who refused to remove their animals and were allowed to defy the federal government comes to mind as an embarassing and in fact dangerous example of the anti-government mindset so prevalent among some of the long-term permittees.

The FS also needs to be focused on the recovery of imperiled and endangered species under its chartered duties. That priority is incompatible with the interests of ranchers and their domesticated animals who want to replace the native species, and take advantage of cheap rent instead of purchasing their own private property elsewhwere, which farmers all over America normally expect to do, in order to call themselves true farmers. This particular practice has become a kind of hereditary entitlement program which needs to be phased out as soon as possible.

FUrthermore, it is now the BIden administration, and the Forest Service needs to recognize the change in priorities which align much more with the general public, rather than with special interests and private profiteers. As you well know, the leftover ill-designed plan put forward by the anti-environmental staffers from the corrupt Trump administration put forward the dangerous and irresponsible idea of allowing MORE grazing than is currenlty permitted. Such a proposal flies in the face not only of responsible land stewardship, and accelerate the existing threat to our native flora and fauna from the climate emergency. It also contradicts the Biden-Harris ethos and their 30x30 land conservation agenda, taking lands that could be protected and throwing them away to please the special interests of the commercial livestock industry.

The Forest Service simply has to step up and be the public stewards of these precious lands and the creatures who have lived here for the past 8,000 years. That commitment can only be fulfilled by admitting the mistakes of

the past like people of courage must be able to do. That necessary action is to throw out these unwise and short-sighted Rangeland Management Directives that have been proposed under the Old rape and pillage philosophy of the Trump regime.

Furthermore, to behave in a responsible and ecologically informed manner, FS simply must respect the National Environmental Policy Act, and use that law as their 'compass' for any change to Forest Service directives.