Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/7/2021 7:02:11 AM
First name: Greg
Last name: Kallio
Organization:
Title:
Comments: There were 104 comments and letters submitted to the USFS concerning the June 2019 Notice of Proposed Action (NOPA) for the Bridgeport Southwest Rangeland Project. Of these, 97 respondents were non-supportive or against the proposed action, 5 respondents were supportive, and 2 respondents appeared neutral. While the USFS may have read all the comments and letters, it is clear that they were largely ignored with no rebuttals or amendments that addressed the concerns of the 97 respondents who were against the proposal. Instead, the December 2021 NOPA contains an amendment that bypasses existing rules by allowing cattle watering troughs to be located within the 0.6-mile exclusion buffer adjacent to riparian areas prescribed in the Bi-state Sage-grouse Amendment. Thus, the USFS is attempting to loosen the rules for the purpose of pushing this proposal through - without acknowledging the numerous, well-articulated objections stated in prior comments, some of which were written by knowledgeable experts in this field and former USFS employees. Needless to say, my position against this project is even more steadfast now, as I'm sure it is for the other 96 respondents to the June 2019 NOPA.

After reading all the comments and the current NOPA, I have come to the conclusion that this project is the culmination of a special deal made by the USFS to appease a livestock company (FIM Corporation) and to avoid a costly lawsuit stemming from their sheep-grazing permit cancellation (due to Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep disease transmission issue). By allowing the FIM Corporation to now graze their cattle on said lands, it is expected that any lawsuit or claims for reimbursement will not happen. Is this a viable Need for Action? Is there any public benefit for allowing cattle grazing on these pristine lands (including Wilderness), for which there is no historical precedent? Does the written Need for Action discuss the relationship between the desired condition and the existing condition and then justify taking such action? The answers are NO; this is a win for the USFS and the FIM Corporation, while the public loses.