

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/1/2024 12:53:37 AM

First name: Jeff

Last name: Wentzel

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear Lolo Plan Revision Team,

Please consider the following comments for the proposed action for the Lolo National Forest Land Management Plan Revision. I have many concerns regarding how the Forest Service conducted the revision process. Once the proposed action was released the Forest Service had very little public outreach and education to discuss the impact the plan will have on the public for decades to come. Massive amounts of text, data and maps were released and the public not given sufficient time to review.

I do not like how the forest lands are split into so many specific categories of land use. The forest plan is supposed to refer to general management and not have anything that is site specific. The recommended wilderness designation is so extremely prohibitive to any type of use other than hiking that it is essentially site specific to any area labeled as such. The plan also does not allow for any changes in management as conditions may permit. If congress were not to act on a recommended wilderness area or vote against an area becoming wilderness the management method would not change under this plan. If a massive fire burnt a large area of recommended wilderness the area couldn't be selectively logged or some of the closed roads couldn't be opened for recreation or resource extraction. The recommended wilderness designation is so prohibitive and so rigid in its management that it is site specific and should not be included in this plan. These lands should be considered low impact and open to change as conditions may permit.

The areas in the plan considered for recommended wilderness are absurd. The legal definition of wilderness is well understood to mean an area "untrammeled by man". Almost all the areas chosen to be recommended for wilderness have been previously logged, contain closed roads and motorized trails.

The Forest Service may have changed the definition of what constitutes a roadless area to one that hasn't had an open road in at least one years time, but because an area may be considered roadless does not in any way mean it should be recognized as wilderness.

There should not be any recommended wilderness areas included in this plan. All current motorized and mechanized activities in these areas should be allowed to continue. Too much of the forest is already off limits to any type of motorized or mechanized recreation it is becoming a serious issue. Areas are becoming overcrowded and user conflicts are increasing. People tend to recreate in areas that allow motorized recreation and areas where automobiles are allowed for access for other non-motorized activities.

One of the largest complaints I hear from the public is the lack of motorized access on the forest. Whether it is motorized single track, under 50" ATV trails or just gated roads people want to use for hunting, camping, hiking further in, berry picking etc. Most of the 1000+ miles of closed roads were justified by the Forest Service as necessary for wildlife security. This wildlife security was mostly for the benefit of the Grizzly Bear which was classified as endangered. It's not very difficult to argue that the decline in Grizzly Bear population was due to over hunting but somehow it was argued that a high density of roads has a significant impact on Grizzly recovery. It is very likely that the Grizzly will be delisted in the near future and the State of Montana will allow limited hunting. It would only make sense that the high demand for motorized access by the public would prompt the Forest Service to include in their plan a reasonable path to open some roads in high demand areas for the benefit of the public. Some forest districts have almost no motorized use for vehicles under 50" or single track loop opportunities. It would be so easy to convert closed roads to motorized trail opportunities but I don't see anything in the proposed plan to address these issues. The plan to address motorized recreation for the next decade or two just doesn't exist.

The Forest Service offers so many different classifications of land use but they offer so few alternatives for how it should be managed. The choices come down to how much more land should be closed for motorized recreation and resource extraction, almost all of it, a great deal of it, or a good deal of it.

The proposed Forest Plan was so poorly executed it fails the very public it is supposed to benefit. The Forest Service did very little public education and outreach after the proposed plan was released and gave very little time to review all the relevant information and have questions answered by the Forest Service. The plan does

very little to address current problems with forest management and lack of access. The plan also fails to address potential future changes on the forest and their ability to adapt to these changes. There are too many areas that being turned into "no-management/no access/wilderness" areas as opposed to managed areas. By creating such restrictive no-management areas the Forest Service is actually making site-specific decisions which should not be allowed.