

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/26/2020 11:36:12 PM

First name: Lynne

Last name: Nelson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am concerned that the draft plan poses a severe threat to the wildlands of the Clearwater. The FS has indicated that any roadless areas not recommended as wilderness in the new forest plan could be developed (logged). These irreplaceable roadless areas, which provide some of the best habitat in the Basin, should instead be recommended as Wilderness, including the roadless areas adjacent to the Gospel - Hump Wilderness, which were wrongfully omitted in the 2008 Idaho Roadless Rule. Weitas Creek in particular, deserves to be recommended. The draft plan would also allow development in wild and scenic rivers, and most alternatives would be less protective than the existing condition- rendering an already degraded river corridor less wild and less scenic. When I travel into the Clearwater Forest I want to see the Clearwater Forest, not the Clearcut Forest.

There are no quantitative standards for protecting watersheds and fish and wildlife habitat in the new draft plan. This is a huge problem, as the current plan has enforceable standards that the agency must adhere to. Considering the current crisis facing wild steelhead and salmon, this draft plan would further drive each species towards extinction.

The draft plan would allow logging in designated old growth, a departure from current standards that protect old growth habitat from development. This could greatly affect old-growth dependent species like the imperiled Northern Rockies Fisher.

Grizzly bear recovery is ignored in the draft plan. Natural corridors on both forests would be fragmented, and there would be little-to-no secure habitat for grizzlies outside of designated Wilderness.

Please reconsider the forest plan as presented, is destructive and appears to be in conflict with best practices for healthy forest, rivers and watersheds.

Thank you for listening,