Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/20/2021 3:46:39 PM
First name: Bruce
Last name: Hoeft
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I worked on fire crews in the Olympic National Forest for several seasons in the 1970s, and was blessed with the chance to learn some of the landscape above Hood Canal. I also submitted comments on several forest plans (I recall the Canal-Front Planning Unit) during subsequent years, and was struck by an obvious bias build into the EISs. Five options, suggesting that the review process would consider a wide range of management possibilities. Option A always seemed to leave 90% of the forest in question alone. Option B was leave 50%. Option C was to log 90%, D log 95%, and E, log it all. Option C, the "middle" one, always involved significant extraction of commercial value from the forest.

And at the end of the day, the Forest Service consistently chose Option C. It appeared to be an unbiased review, but the process was clearly set up to benefit commercial interests.

It was a long time ago, and I've been pleased to find that Forest Service managers today have a much wider range of views on responsible management. At least where I live, that's true when they are able to devote resources away from the demands of dealing with wildfires. But that's a different issue, but I am grateful for the work you all do.

I hope that the draft forest review plan for Manti-La Sal will include the Conservation Alternative. It is a reasonable, well-documented and thought-out option, which should be a part of the considerations for the new forest plan.

Bruce Hoeft