

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/26/2023 4:05:48 PM

First name: Michael

Last name: Fiflis

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I do not support the proposed action to maintain the status quo.

This is Wilderness with a capital "W." What takes precedence over domestic livestock grazing? Everything. Native wildlife. Health of the watershed. Preservation of the Wilderness experience.

How many native predators - e.g. black bears, mountain lions, and coyotes - are killed each year in the High Uintas Wilderness to protect domestic sheep?

What effects would continued domestic sheep grazing have on the recovery of native wildlife such as bighorn sheep, wolves, and grizzly bears?

How will native bighorn sheep recolonize their native range across the High Uintas when domestic sheep carry disease fatal to the bighorns?

I support the "no grazing" alternative.

The Forest Service should retire grazing permits that are voluntarily waived back to the agency, giving the ranchers the opportunity to seek compensation from conservation interests before the allotments are permanently closed.

If, however, domestic livestock grazing is allowed to continue in any form, it should be limited to ensure the following:

- No competition with wildlife for food or space.
- No disease spread to native species.
- No killing of native predators to protect domestic animals.
- No degradation of water quality in the watersheds.
- No impact to the Wilderness visitor experience.