

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/17/2020 7:00:00 AM

First name: Carlotta

Last name: Grandstaff

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on a forest plan amendment addressing elk habitat objectives, although, frankly, I'm a little unsure of what to say since I'm struggling with what it is the BNF is trying to accomplish with this amendment. What is the point?

Amending the existing plan is not a good habit to form since theoretically, there would be no end to it. If successful, I can foresee a forest plan that is never revised, but is amended one species at a time. What species would face the amendment ax next? Pileated woodpeckers? Pine martens? Cedars?

The more thoughtful approach is to revise the existing forest plan and incorporate new research into it, rather than amend it piecemeal. Regardless of how difficult it will be, especially considering the minefield of local politics we'd all have to struggle through, the forest plan revision is a requirement and a collective public responsibility.

The forest plan hasn't been revised in more than three decades, and I don't know if the BNF has already begun the forest plan revision, or not. Either way, now would be a good time to get on it with it, otherwise I can see where this amendment business is heading, and it's not a good path for the forest, the wildlife, the trees and every other living thing that calls the BNF home.

Thank you,

Carlotta Grandstaff