

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 7/10/2019 9:52:25 PM

First name: Lila

Last name: Chirieleison

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Scoping questions

1) The project does not adequately address the impact of "thinning" and burning forests on the extreme global warming that Earth is already experiencing and that is worsening at a much greater rate than the Forest Service recognizes. Current science is clear that the most powerful and practical solution to global warming within the jurisdiction of the Forest Service is to plant trees that will sequester carbon--NOT cut them down and burn them up, which releases into the atmosphere the carbon that trees have sequestered. The impact of the project on global warming must be studied thoroughly and should ideally be studied in comparison with the scientific approach, which would be to PLANT TREES, not cut them down and burn them up.

2) The whole project must be analyzed via an Environmental Impact Statement. The Forest Service has broken up a 107,000-acre project into several smaller projects. This is an attempt to avoid the Environmental Impact Statement that is required by law for the actual scope of this 107,000-acre project..

3) Analysis should be site-specific, not "condition-based."

4) The Scoping Document is severely lacking in the range of important information that is needed to write meaningful scoping comments. See #1, above.

5) The scoping comment period must be extended for at least 30-60 days, due to the fact that the Forest Service failed to provide a way that the public could submit comment via email, by providing an email comment link that appeared to submit users' comments but in reality returned them as "undeliverable," with no alternative functional email address. Additionally, the public needs more time to engage and to become informed, especially since the Forest Service has silenced citizen groups opposed to the project by not giving these groups equal time in Public information sessions.

Sincerely,
Lila Loffredo