

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/15/2020 12:00:00 PM

First name: M

Last name: Anon

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Make a better plan to keep Shoshone National Forest wild

Dear Shoshone National Forest Supervisor Lisa Timchak,

I absolutely hate the motorized vehicle component to this plan. I think it's stupid and ridiculous and that's what nature is not of that, the complete opposite actually. Nature is about the wildlife, the trees and the natural beauty. I repeat, quotation marks the natural beauty quotation marks, and the quiet, listening to the birds sing, squawk, flap, the rustling of leaves the snapping of twigs. With the motorized vehicles you will be crushing innocent wildlife victims under the brush. The noise is horrible, too, scaring everything within five miles. It off sets the habitat in which the wildlife should be a custom. A dreadful idea, but you're all about the money, right? It's all about the money. HATE IT, hate it, hate it! You're not thinking of the big picture. Besides, you have no right.

Dear Supervisor Timchak,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Shoshone National Forest Travel Management Plan's preliminary Environmental Assessment (EA). As an American, I am keenly interested in how Shoshone National Forest's public lands are managed.

The Shoshone National Forest, surrounding the eastern and southern sides of Yellowstone National Park and providing essential habitat for a myriad of wildlife species that live throughout the Greater Yellowstone Ecoregion, is a special forest with a unique wild character, and it should receive the best possible management. Unfortunately, I don't think the preliminary EA measures up to the high management standard that is needed, in numerous ways.

Because of the unique location and wild character of the Shoshone National Forest, the Forest Service should prioritize protection of wildlife and critical wildlife habitat on the Shoshone, but I don't see that prioritization in this preliminary assessment. I see the potential for significant impacts to wildlife from existing and expanded motorized use, both winter and summer, and I do not see appropriate detailed analysis of those potential impacts in the EA. For example, grizzly bears as they emerge from hibernation likely will be impacted by late season snowmobiling and motorized snow biking in some areas that are open to motorized use. Ungulates with newborn calves may be significantly harmed by motorized use, both snow-based and land-based vehicles. All potential impacts to wildlife from motorized travel on the forest must be identified and appropriately analyzed, and that hasn't been adequately done in this EA.

Potential conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreational users, both winter and summer, are not analyzed, and measures to avoid or minimize those impacts are not evaluated. Potential impacts of motorized

use to riparian areas, wet meadows, steep hills with substantial erosion potential, or other resource-damaging problems are not adequately analyzed.

In light of the many obvious potential significant impacts to wildlife, conflicts between different types of recreation uses, and possible damage to natural resources, it is apparent that an EA is not sufficient. I therefore urge you to withdraw this inadequate EA and redo the necessary analyses of all potentially significant impacts in an Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

M Sampery

[PII]

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Lillian Miller at Sierra Club at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500.