

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/1/2019 8:09:49 PM

First name: Neil

Last name: Matthews-Pennanen

Organization:

Title:

Official Representative/Member Indicator:

Address1: PO Box 1264

Address2:

City: Red Lodge

State:

Province/Region: MT

Zip/Postal Code: 59068

Country: United States

Email: neil.pennanen@gmail.com

Phone: 2482592917

Comments:

I have the following input on Forestwide Direction, subsection ecosystems:

For Watershed Restoration, I prefer alternative D for each objective 1-3. I see no reason why the alternative with the most resources put toward watershed restoration should not be chosen. You may notice a theme with my forestwide direction preferences in that I will tend to suggest the alternative where the most energy is put into projects. Should I be indicating what the highest priorities are to me? I don't know why anyone would be against, for example, more watershed restoration, if they don't have to say that other project areas are not a priority for them.

For At-Risk Plant Species, I prefer alternative D for objective 1: 3 projects per decade for restoring habitats or populations.

For Forested Vegetation, I prefer alternative D for both objective 1 and 2.

For Fire, I prefer alternative D for objective 1: the highest amount of hazardous fuels mitigation seems like the right amount. We have been seeing hotter summers and bigger fires over the past few years. Staying on top of areas we know there are hazardous fuels to try to get ahead of the problem seems like an absolute must.

For Invasive Species, I prefer alternative D for objective 1. Being as aggressive as possible in dealing with invasive species seems like the right call. If we don't invest in taking care of them and keeping them at bay right now, it will cost us a lot more over the long term.

For Wildlife, I prefer alternative D for objective 1 and 2. Completing as many projects as we can to maintain, improve, and protect habitats and populations of at-risk wildlife seems like the most responsible option. As far as the guidelines for wildlife, protecting key linkages does seem like it should be a priority given the projections for a changing climate. We don't want to box wildlife into one area if the habitat around them is changing. Alternative E does not make this a priority so one of the other alternatives (B,C, or D) ought to be selected for this aspect of the plan.

For Bison, I prefer alternative B/C for objective 1. Expanding habitat slowly for bison seems like a good way to go. People seem to get upset when the bison range is expanded because they're worried about cows and brucellosis. Expanding too quickly may be difficult to stomach for some folks. For guideline 1, I prefer alternative B/C/D. The management areas should have vegetation that favors bison over livestock. For guideline 3, I prefer alternative B/C/E, bison movement should not be impeded unless there is some compelling reason that an agency needs to do so.

For grizzlies, I don't quite understand the grizzly relocation site objective (objective 1). Does the number of sites have an impact on how many grizzlies are able to be relocated? Does it affect grizzly communities if one site is used several times? I guess more relocation sites would be better, but I hope that the number of grizzlies that need to be relocated end up being relocated. I don't think that should be affected by the number of sites available. Does the forest service have a good idea of how many sites are needed from year to year?

I have the following input on Forestwide Direction, subsection Benefits to People:

For Cultural and Historic Resources, I prefer alternative B/C for objective 1. More outreach and education will allow more people to know and care about the resources. For objective 2, I prefer alternative D. Let's aim to assess 25 percent per year.

For Timber, I do not seek to weigh in with my preferred amount of timber harvested. Instead, I think the amount of timber harvested should be determined by the health of the forest. Is there an optimum way to manage the forest balancing forest health while reducing fuel load. I think the scope of timber harvest should be a result of questions on how we keep our forests healthy and thriving for generations to come, not based on how much timber we want to produce.

For General Recreation, I prefer alternative D for objective 1. We should remove as many problematic camp sites that are damaging the environment as we can.

For Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized Settings, I prefer alternative B/C/E for objective 1. Let's get rid of as many unauthorized motorized travel incursions as we can.

For Recommended Wilderness Areas, I prefer alternative C/D for Suitability 2. There is no motorized or mechanized travel in wilderness areas, to my knowledge. It makes sense to me that this standard is maintained in areas the Forest Service is recommending to be adopted as Wilderness.

For Land Status and Ownership, Access, I prefer alternative B/C/D for Objective 1. Filling gaps in existing public access should be the priority, not timber harvesting.

I have the following input for Chapter 3: Proposed Geographic Area Direction.

I have chosen to focus on the geographic areas I have decided are most relevant to me: the Pryor Mountains and the Absaroka Beartooth Mountains.

In the Pryor Mountains, under Desired Condition 1, I prefer alternative C. Quiet, nonmotorized recreation should predominate.

In the Pryor Mountains, under Suitability 2, I do not know which alternative to choose. I think there should be some areas available to motorized uses. I don't know if the "backcountry areas" proposed are the right extent of these allowed uses. I also think there should be some areas of the Pryors where motorized uses aren't seen and preferably not heard. That's probably totally useless to you though.

In the Absaroka Beartooth Mountains, for Recommended Wilderness Area, I think alternative D goes a bit too far. Alternative B/C would be preferred by me in terms of how much wilderness may potentially be added. There is already a lot of wilderness area in the Absaroka-Beartooth region, and I think motorized and mechanized users will feel squeezed out of possibilities for their preferred type of recreation if more of the forest is managed as wilderness.