

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/28/2020 5:49:57 PM

First name: Tanya

Last name: Gale

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for soliciting public comments for the revised Forest Plan, and for extending the comment period, especially as the revision was released to the public immediately before the winter holidays. Thank you also for hosting a public meeting in Moscow on January 25, 2020, although I found it unfortunate that there was no Q&A session.

I have some areas of concern about the Forest Plan Revision and the alternatives listed. My top concern is in regards to climate change. As you know, anthropomorphic climate change is already in evidence all around us. Flooding, droughts, fires, and other weather patterns are getting stronger and harder for people and animals to face. Vast swatches of Australia are burning as I write this, and we've recently seen some terrible fires in the Amazon rain forest as well. As our world struggles to balance our economy with a habitable planet, one thing is certain: we need forests. From a carbon perspective, trees are astonishing: imagine a machine that uses sunlight to capture and sequester carbon in itself and the soil, while providing habitat, preventing erosion, and cleaning pollutants out of the air. Yet each of your alternatives in the Revised Forest Plan increases logging. We need an alternative that acknowledges the reality of climate change and decreases logging.

Another leading concern in this revised forest plan is the lack of quantifiable standards. The current forest plan has measurable, quantifiable standards in regards to old growth, water quality, and habitat. The new forest plan does not, and I find that remarkable and disturbing. Especially frightening is the language in regards to old growth, where logging can occur anywhere except where it would "likely modify the characteristics" of old growth for more than ten years. I can see where inexact language would be administratively convenient; but we (the public) demand accountability. The revised forest plan needs quantifiable standards to hold the agency accountable to the public.

Last of all, the Revised Forest Plan needs to plan for the recovery of grizzly bears. The current forest plan acknowledges the potential for grizzly bears to return to the area, and we've recently seen multiple grizzly bears come into the Nez Perce Clearwater National Forest. However, the Revised Forest Plan fails to mention them. The Revised Forest Plan needs to plan for the return of the grizzly.

Thanks again for inviting the public to participate in the Forest Plan Revision process. I hope you'll consider climate change, quantifiable standards, and grizzly bears before you release a final Forest Plan.