

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/16/2020 5:54:13 PM

First name: Thomas

Last name: Uhling

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing this feedback in hopes that the new revision plan will work for the people of this great country providing recreation and much needed resources for our current generation and future generations. I attended the presentation in Lewiston Idaho this winter where the information on the various proposed plans was discussed. I want to thank you for taking the time to help educate the public on this material. From the information I received at the presentations and online I am recommending the following:

Plan X - Wilderness Allocation

Plan X - Wild and Scenic River Suitability

Plan X - Summer motorized Access

Plan X - Winter motorized Access

Plan X - Timber Harvest

Below are some discussion points I have put together that support why I have chosen this plan. In truth I wish there was a plan to reverse some of the recent closures in the last decade or two and open more land up for access by the public and increase our efforts in forest management through timber harvest, fuel reduction, restoration, and salvage.

I grew up in Idaho County and still live near Idaho today in Spokane WA. I enjoy the outdoor recreational activities including wheeled motorized, river rafting, and over-snow vehicle access that Idaho national forest provide and have many family members and friends that also enjoy the same. As you have shown with your numbers there are more and more people that are going out and enjoying the forest. This begs the question about closing access by making more areas designated as non-motorized vs leaving them open for the increased number of people who are trying to gain access. After all these lands are public lands and should be accessible to all for enjoyment not just the few who have the capability and resources to access them by foot or horseback. I am an engineer and by nature like to analyze things. One approach to this I looked at is the number of acres in the forest covered by roads vs the total number of acres. When you do this type of analysis you realize that the roads are a minuscule number of acres in comparison to the total acres and do not significantly diminish the land that is available for wildlife and vegetation. It therefore makes one wonder why are we so concerned about closing them down, shouldn't we leave the limited access we have intact for the people who live in this country to have the chance to access it and enjoy it? Maybe even consider rescinding the Idaho Roadless Rule? I think yes. I spend a lot of time in the NezPerce and Clearwater forest. I see people from all over the country enjoying these areas and advocate for leaving them as accessible as we possibly can. Opening up a few new roads and campgrounds would go a long way to helping the increase in numbers of people wanting to access this great land the opportunity to do so.

Over the last few decades I have witnessed many things in the forest that don't seem to make sense to me and in some instances seem quite disturbing. For example I have witnessed road reclamation where a large dozer and track hoe are used to break open an old road that was overgrown with trees and natural brush and then re-closed by scraping soil and foliage debris back across the road to close off access. This created large scars across the forest and from a practical point of view provided absolutely no value. Had this money been spent maintaining the roads we actually use it would have provided some real value and upkeep for our forest. I have also ridden my wheeled motorized vehicle across many of the remaining open roads within the forest and witnessed first-hand the destruction forest fires cause. Not only do they burn a valuable resource they leave behind a barren land that suffers from erosion and the death of many wildlife that are unable to escape the fire. Doesn't this accomplish just the opposite we are trying to achieve of protecting endangered species, avoiding erosion in our rivers and streams that endangers the fish? Think of the pollution and CO2 produced by forest fires, this also goes against the current need to limit pollution and CO2 output. I read an article on the internet that stated the following about California "The wildfires released 68 million tons of carbon dioxide in 2018, according to the US Geological Survey, or 15% of the state's total emissions. For comparison, all electricity use in California in 2016

produced roughly 76 million tons in emissions." This is significant and should be a concern for all of us. I have heard the adage that fires have been happening for all time and are natural so we need to let them occur naturally and run their course. The "let it burn idea". Yes they are natural and up until about a century ago mankind did not have the capability to control them. But now we do have the tools, resources, and capabilities to control them. So why not control fires by wisely managing our forest through timber harvest. If timber harvest was done in a way to build fire breaks that would limit the size and acreage forest fires could consume we would not only lower the cost of fighting fires we would limit their damage. This would provide money saving outcomes by limiting the effort to fight fires while also providing increased natural resources for our great country. If it were up to me I would recommend this kind of effort in all of the forest areas including non-motorized and wilderness. I would rather see a wilderness area with well managed timber harvesting and re-planting vs massive large swaths of burnt forest.