Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/17/2021 8:37:18 PM
First name: Bryan
Last name: Wyberg
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I am writing to provide comments on the changes to grazing regulations proposed by the prior administration on their way out the door.

First, I believe that the management of our public lands must be governed by what is best for the land - as identified by peer-reviewed scientific analysis and on the ground research. As such, this grazing proposal is a travesty. It was hurriedly thrown together to beat the January 20th end of term deadline. It was clearly devoid of any scientific basis and cannot be justified by scientific analysis. As most of what the Trump Administration perpetrated, it was done for special interests who provided support and campaign donations to the president. There was no attempt at balance in management approach, and it disregarded the historical underpinnings of grazing allotment management. For example, it seeks to return all retired allotments back to active grazing without consideration that many of these retired allotments were purchased by conservation groups and donated with the knowledge that they would be retired permanently. That is unconscionable, and must be reversed

I believe that any major regulation changes such as this grazing proposal MUST be the result of thorough analysis and consideration of potential impacts. Hmm - wait a minute - that is exactly what is required by NEPA: the fifty year old bedrock environmental policy governing federal government decision making, and that pesky rule of law which the prior administration and their political appointees worked so hard to eviscerate and in general - ignore completely. Well, NEPA is the law, and I demand that the government follow the law. There can be no question but that this entire proposal must be withdrawn and any future changes that may come be made based on the result of peer-reviewed scientific analysis and consideration of cumulative impacts.

One could go on forever with the list of reasons these grazing rule changes should be scrapped, withdrawn, and any changes reconsidered in a transparent, science based process. Only those changes found to have no significant impact should be promulgated. Above all, we must protect the land from over grazing and the critical riparian areas from damage by grazing livestock. As stewards of these public lands, it is your responsibility to ensure that management of grazing on these lands is balanced in consideration of the conservation value of these lands.

Retired allotments must remain retired. Less grazing is clearly better for the land, and I support reduced grazing on our public lands. Particularly important would be the general retirement of grazing from all designated wilderness areas. I believe wilderness is for wildlife and that grazing is an example of man's modification of natural processes, which runs counter to the intent of the Wilderness Act. It is now time to eliminate grazing from our wilderness areas.

Thank you for considering these thoughts. I trust the Biden Administration will follow the rule of law and will promulgate only changes which are balanced and which further the goals of conservation and the fight against climate change.

Thank you.