

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 3/16/2019 12:00:00 AM

First name: Ron

Last name: Normandeau

Organization: Recreational aviation foundation

Title: State Liaison

Official Representative/Member Indicator:

Address1: 317 Montana Landing

Address2:

City: Polson

State: MT

Province/Region: Montana

Zip/Postal Code: 59860

Country: United States

Email: rnormandeau@theraf.org

Phone: 4065295661

Comments:

See Attachment

### Custer Gallatin NF Forest Plan

I am a retired employee of the U.S. Forest Service, Region One, Engineering, now engaged in a lifelong passion, recreational flying, and I function, now, as a MT. State Liaison for the Recreational Aviation Foundation. You have seen this sentence before.

I have read and evaluated the DEIS and conclude the document is everything CFR 40 Ch. 5, 1502.15 says a statement should not be: [ldquo]Agencies shall avoid useless bulk in statements and shall concentrate effort and attention on important issues. Verbose descriptions of the affected environment are themselves no measure of the adequacy of an environmental impact statement[rldquo]. It is essentially a 933-page document that provides no discussion of the environmental issues that will face the managers over the next 15 to 25 years.

The alternatives presented address nothing and provide no measurable comparison for the environmental impacts of the activities perceived to take place over the above stated time frame. Please visit CFR 40 Ch. 5 1502.14 Alternatives including the proposed action.

This document provides no means to measure the impacts on the different activities set forth in the requirements: CFR 40 Ch.5, 1502.16 Environmental consequences, 1508.8 Effects, 1508.25 Scope, or 1508.27 Significantly.

In light of the recent dismissal of the Blue Mtn forests Plan an EIS in the objection process, this DEIS is going to go the same way.

To aviation access to the forest. This DEIS essentially says there will be no general aviation activity on this forest. As with other activities occurring on the forest there is no discussion of positive or negative impacts, benefits to community economics, alternatives for access, or relation to dispersed recreation.

The suitability statement in this DEIS is in error with the only two legal (supported by law) exceptions being established, wilderness and research natural areas. There are examples across all 9 regions of the Forest Service of example of airstrips in all these areas, including wilderness areas.

The [ldquo]Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st-Century Act of July 6, 2012 (Pub. L. 112-141)[rldquo], recited in your document states [ldquo]This act authorizes funding for Federal lands transportation facilities and Federal lands access transportation facilities under a unified program[rldquo]. Since 2015 the Recreation appropriation to the Forest Service has designated \$750,000.00 to maintenance of airstrips on NFS Lands.

I again state there are no discussion of environmental impact of airstrips that would aid future managers in determining the access appropriate to the existing condition.