

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/28/2020 5:28:21 AM

First name: Doug

Last name: Oien

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Based just on the Current Plan Evaluation Summary, I think it is absolutely necessary to revise the Forest Plans.

First, the plans need to incorporate, if not be based on, the Idaho Roadless Rule. I live in Western Washington and when I first heard that Idaho was doing their own roadless rule I was concerned because I forgot how well the people of Idaho understand and appropriately value their wild areas and public lands in general. While I may have some small disagreements with it based on what I have seen in my travels in Idaho, I think it would be very difficult to put together a more perfect balance of protecting wild areas and recreation-based businesses and providing for extractive and other commercial uses. From a purely fiscal perspective, road building and maintenance budgets are not going to increase so road systems need to be consolidated and the Idaho Roadless Rule can provide guidance in how to do that. And the Roadless Rule identifies plenty of areas closer to main roads that are appropriate for commercial use and where there is even more need for active management to decrease fire risk, invasive species, etc. and improve forest health.

Second, the Current Plan Evaluation Summary makes it sound like the ESA, PACFISH, and INFISH are part of the problem when in fact they are symptoms that show that the Forest Plans have failed. Anadromous fish are part of the heritage and culture of all people of the Pacific Northwest and should be adequately protected. The Forest Service shouldn't need to be forced to protect the runs. An adequate Forest Plan should prevent the necessity of invoking the ESA in the first place. Actions like the sage grouse effort are far better than invoking the ESA. And I personally believe that the majority of protections need to occur on federal lands so that there is less impact on private lands.

I have seen spotted knapweed far off trail in the Selway-Bitterroot and FCRNR Wildernesses. While I am not sure what could have been done to prevent the spread, the current Forest Plans certainly didn't prevent the spread.

As I noted in my comments on Wilderness designation, there seems to be a lack of coordination between adjacent National Forests.

Overall, a Forest Plan needs to foresee and aim to prevent future issues rather than reacting after the fact. That is the underlying reason I believe the Forest Plans need to be revised and not just amended. The Idaho Roadless Rule provides valuable guidance into the future rather than a helter-skelter approach.