

From: [Jeff Lonn](#)
To: [FS-appeals-northern-regional-office](#)
Subject: [External Email]East Paradise AMP
Date: Thursday, May 13, 2021 4:42:06 PM

[External Email]

If this message comes from an **unexpected sender** or references a **vague/unexpected topic**;
Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.
Please send any concerns or suspicious messages to: Spam.Abuse@usda.gov

Alex Sienkiewicz
District Ranger
Yellowstone Ranger District
Custer Gallatin National Forest

RE: East Paradise AMP Objection--Jeff Lonn

Thank you for leaving the Suce Creek and Sixmile South allotments vacant. They should be permanently retired. Mill Creek should also be left vacant, especially since noxious weeds are a problem there, and livestock grazing will never help that situation. Retiring vacant allotments is an easy way to increase ecosystem health.

In my scoping comments, I urged you to choose Alternative 1, No Action, which would have vacated all the allotments, because it has the greatest benefit to the fish, wildlife, vegetation, and public. Your final EA also admits this is true, but yet you did not choose Alt 1. Why not?

The final EA continues to falsely claim that cattle will target non-native grass species when the science overwhelmingly shows that cattle universally increase invasive species. In fact, you are opening the allotments earlier under your false assumption. Please provide sound science to support this action.

The final EA and draft decision state that "adaptive management" will be used, but in my experience, the USFS likes to use the term but almost never actually practices it. Adaptive management means that rigorous monitoring is done to inform future decisions and policies. Here in Bitterroot National Forest, I have seen no monitoring, and never any changes to future practices. It is merely a buzzword used to slide projects through. I can only assume CGNF operates in the same manner.

As I said in my earlier comments, I have spent considerable time hiking in this area. There are few things that spoil a wildland experience faster than encountering a bunch of cows trashing the landscape.

New information in your draft decision indicated that most of the 23,000 comments you received were form letters "expressing support for bison and wilderness". Which alternative did they support? I doubt they supported continued livestock grazing. And why are you disregarding these comments--23,000 people took the time to submit them. Does NEPA allow their dismissal? I am disturbed that the public comments and your responses to them are not available on the website. The NEPA process is supposed to be open and transparent, and this is anything but.

NEPA also requires you to use best available science to inform your decisions, and the science increasingly shows that the best thing for the land is to retire grazing allotments. There are no benefits to cattle grazing on forest or rangeland ecosystems. There are no benefits to the American people, who own these lands, either. Please reconsider your decision, and retire all six grazing allotments.

Jeff Lonn

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]