

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/26/2023 4:12:25 PM

First name: Craig

Last name: Wallentine

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the High Uintas Domestic Sheep program. Please adopt Alternative Number One - no domestic sheep in the Uintas and implement as fast as reasonable for the reasons listed below.

1) As a backpacker, I have always carefully treated my drinking water because of giardia contamination in the High Uinta Wilderness area. Private citizens should not be penalized by commercial interests who do not take responsibility for the pollution they introduce.

2) Bighorn sheep are susceptible to domestic sheep diseases as demonstrated in the Henry Mountains of Utah. Native wildlife should not be penalized by diseases introduced by commercial interests.

3) Climate change is real. Heavy grazing by domestic sheep in the fragile lands as detailed in the Uinta scientific studies only worsens the climate threat. I always talk with the Forest Service rangers I meet when hiking and they point out that climate change is making plants and animals more susceptible to domestic threats and diseases. Eliminating domestic sheep from the proposed grazing range will help sequester more carbon and mitigate the overall climate challenge we face.

4) When hiking in the Uintas, the meadow "mowing", the hillside defacement, the accelerated shallow lake sedimentation and the stream bank damage of grazing is apparent. Since as much as 7% of the GDP of the State of Utah comes from outdoor recreation of all kinds. It makes no economic sense to allow commercial interests to degrade the forest and mountains for the people who actually own these public lands.

5) Backcountry fishing and hunting should be encouraged because they are much less damaging than domestic sheep grazing in the High Uintas. It is time to gradually retire all domestic livestock grazing licenses in the Uintas and allow the native species to flourish.

6) Promoting natural wildlife over domestic sheep grazing will reduce taxpayer costs for natural predator control and claimed losses by ranchers. If Wyoming wants to graze sheep and cattle on their public land and use their taxpayer money to reimburse inflated claims for cattle losses to predators, fine. Not in Utah.

7) The economic analysis presented in the DEIS does not include the significant taxpayer spends to support domestic grazing versus the tiny lease fees that are paid by commercial interests. The entire Uintas are being desecrated for \$2.5MM total? How much would be saved if the damages and costs listed above were eliminated along with the domestic sheep? There is a large literature on welfare ranching in the West. Significant operating subsidies are provided by the Forest Service to commercial interests using public lands as their feedlots. This should be referenced in the DEIS and would likely show a net negative present value of domestic sheep grazing in the Uintas.

8) Once domestic sheep grazing is eliminated, then the question of other livestock needs to be considered. I have seen actual cattle drives right through major trailheads in the Uintas as the cattle just plowed the area on their way to their next public feedlot. The Forest Service should tabulate the damage to vehicles caused by cattle that wander onto the road day and night. Why are humans being placed in continual risk on our public lands for subsidized commercial interests?

9) The Forest Service should poll the many RV, campground and backcountry campers directly about their support for livestock grazing in the Uintas. I believe that it would show overwhelming support for moving all

livestock grazing on to private lands separated from the public lands that the majority of the public do not want despoiled.

10) In closing, there are far more efficient locations for sheep and cattle grazing in the Western United States and across the country than the High Uintas. It no longer makes sense for taxpayers to subsidize the destruction of our public lands for commercial interests that would be better conducted on private land. Thank you.