

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/5/2026 5:42:26 PM

First name: Alan

Last name: Coulter

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Greetings!

For an agency the values public input, the effort to involve the public on this project has been rather limited. Receiving more information half way through the public comment period , and being told that more information will be forthcoming after the public comment period has finished seems rather backwards. One public meeting unrecorded with no information for those of us who were unable to attend in person seems like minimal effort. A categorical exclusion for a heavily used recreation area is clearly a path of least resistance, least work and least information.

Signs of burns on a single tree cross section is hardly convincing of a regular fire regime. In fact the majority of the area is northern hardwood forest which certainly does not need up to 5 prescribed burns in 15 yrs!

Other concerns:

No investigation of endangered species, i.e. Indiana bat.

No example of red oak and pitch pine regeneration without individual tree fencing.

Herbicide use that endangers public health.

No estimation of carbon emission from the project or any changes to the hydrology or future carbon accumulation.

No consideration/evaluation of alternatives.

A "treatment "of large scale burning, cutting and herbicide use is a make work for yourselves approach.

How about letting natural fires burn and have us focus on home hardening, community planning and defensible space with your advice if needed. Eliminate the use of herbicides. Herbicides like Glyphosate and Triclopyr have many understudied impacts. Were you to use herbicides, how about untreated control areas whereby you could do your own studies and show the public results.

Needless to say I am fully dissatisfied with with your process and your proposed treatment!

Sincerely,

Alan Coulter