Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/16/2024 6:17:41 PM
First name: George
Last name: Ochenski
Organization:
Title:
Comments: One might think the Forest Service would learn from Kurt Steele's disastrous attempt to exclude the public from the Holland Lake debacle by using a Categorical Exclusion. Yet, here's the agency once again trying to do the EXACT same thing and, in the process, once again excluding the public from management decisions on public lands, waters, and wilderness. Great example, Mike Munoz was so sincerely interested in having public feedback he "categorically excluded" any contact information for him -- or even a link in his cover letter to the comment page. And you expect us to take your charade of public lands management seriously?

It is utterly impossible for the public to submit comments on the proposed use of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Complex by FOR PROFIT outfitters since your pitiful document doesn't say where they will be, what they will do, what others may be excluded from doing (like camping in their non-designated site), and exactly ZERO information on what such use will do to the environment, the wildlife, the use by the general public, or the cost -- both what the FS will charge these outfitters and what expenses will be incurred by the public to hopefully ensure there might be a couple efforts to monitor the outfitters.
That your own former employee admits the agency refused to enforce the regulations on an outfitter does not bode well for endearing "public trust" in your so-called "management regime."
At some point the general public gets real tired of having government agencies, and particularly the Forest Service, bend over backwards to "meet the demand" for commercial use of lands that were specifically intended to not be "trammeled." Yet, your non-information document basically says there will be a lot of potential trammeling going on -- you just won't tell the public where, for how long, or how much.
You should be ashamed of yourself -- and actually face disciplinary action -- for trying to foist this off on the public as a categorical exclusion. You are paid to analyze the impacts and mitigate them to the greatest extent possible -- and to heed the concerns of the public in that "management." Yet, it's another case of "if we wanted you to know or hear from you, we'd tell you." Obviously, you don't since you didn't disclose any detailed analysis and expect us to simply shrug away the fact that this is another case of government running itself -- despite facetiously claiming to be "public servants."
So, until you decide to provide the public with enough information to actually provide detailed feedback, my "input" will be to put all the outfitters on hold -- and if they're severely disappointed by that, perhaps you'll listen to them and do your job so the public doesn't have to sue you again to force you to follow the law.
Very, very disappointed to see "the once burnt child" of the Forest Service doing the exact same perfidy it attempted at Holland Lake -- only this time in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Complex. Shame on you!