

# *SAR - Forest Plan - Chapter 2 Only*

<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment</i>
------------------	----------------

---

0034938-012

- Conversations with USDA Forest Service personnel indicates that scientific justification was NOT the prevailing rationale used in the application of land use prescriptions in the Proposed Revised Plan. Instead, human desires/needs/etc, were extensively used in setting up the prescription pattern. While I agree that there are needs for dealing with people's feelings and needs -- I do not agree that these should totally outweigh scientific information. I strongly believe that by establishing a land use prescription plan such as is proposed will establish segregated land usage in perpetuity. Once an area is prescribed for a more restrictive usage range, that prescription will never be changed to a less restrictive usage range.
- Several conversations with USDA Forest Service representatives has led to the fact that the Proposed Revised Plan has not been thoroughly reviewed to determine its basic legality. Specifically, this plan has not been subjected to a technical legal review by the federal Office of General Counsel. I believe that it is the USDA Forest Service's responsibility to conduct such a review - it is not the responsibility of 'John Q. Public' to question the legality of federal programs. I personally view this omission as a strong-armed tactic on the part of public servants who are not truly serving in the best interests of the public. Why should I have to spend serious money to legally challenge the legality of a federal program?