

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/19/2020 12:17:16 AM

First name: Kody

Last name: Cochrell

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Hello,

I kept telling myself that I was going to read through all of the details for these plans, but I honestly don't have the time and I know there are plenty of really smart people that have taken plenty of time to get this far. I don't want to waste our time trying to go through each detail to give a short analysis of things you are aware of, but I would like to give a general statement regarding my views on our national forests and how we might use them moving forward. To begin, I have to say that it seems like climate change isn't addressed in this plan. This is potentially one of our biggest problems right now and as a fellow scientist, I'm kind of embarrassed that I have to explain this to people who ask me to inform them of what this plan is. I know our president still believes it's a hoax, but you as scientists should be more involved in research knowledge and I would think understand the seriousness of neglecting it.

I understand that national forests were created to conserve timber for a later generation, and likely a future harvest. Additional reasoning sought to protect watersheds, and I believe associated with this was a desire to stay away from destructive logging. I grew up in Orofino, Idaho, and have always viewed national forests basically as a wilderness area that in my mind was suppose to be as nature intended, and thus free from human-caused changes, like logging. I realize that these forests are prone to catastrophic wildfires, but I also know that nature works in cycles, and maybe we should be preparing for a cycle instead of giving in to the idea of making money. If we need to figure out additional sources for funding, then let's do that, but degrading the national forest itself, to fund the national forest, doesn't seem very productive to me. We also can't allow the need to grow to continue to push for unsustainable practices. I believe there comes a point where we have to just say stop; this is it.

I don't fully believe logging decreases the chances for fires. I think having these machines and people in the woods on top of typical camping and outdoor enthusiasts will ultimately increase the chances for a fire to start. I understand how logging only takes the big wood from the forest, leaving an accumulation of fine debris that is much more prone to burning, especially once the canopy cover has been removed to allow sunlight to penetrate and complete dry everything in the logged area. Even thinning will lead to more drying and likely just a bunch of blowdowns and an even bigger mess. My point is that no logging operation that I've ever seen is anything I would consider to not be destructive. I don't think we're at a point where we can confidently harvest our national forest lands and not leave them looking like the shameful backcountry that now encompasses most of our forests outside of national forests. We have a beautiful thing that is disappearing across the world, and any movement forward to jeopardize this is just wrong. I would say that unless we have options for replacing the carbon sequestration that occurs in these large forests, especially when we use more fossil fuel to tear them down, that maybe we should just stick to the land we already ruined.

People living in the backcountry take the challenge of not having a firetruck down the block. This should be understood and I don't believe its reason to continue to chisel away at our prime wilderness. Nature will not be destroyed if a fire comes through. It happened before, and now we're talking about how it's out of control awesome and therefore we need to cut it down. What will destroy this wilderness, is people. Allowing these logging roads to cut across every drainage and up every ridge will only increase the speed at which these lands are lost. People as a whole have little desire to stop reproducing, hell we don't even talk about the fact that our country is over 90 people per square mile once we spread out. I realize its far less in our great western states but this is exactly what we intend to preserve; opening these lands more will only allow more expansion of our destructive species. Personally, I would like to

see more areas designated as wilderness areas. Even if there is some sort of agreement between logging and designation of wilderness areas, there should really be more added to the list to help preserve these unique habitats. If there's one thing I hate when I'm out in the middle of nowhere, it's the sound of a pack of dirtbikes and quads ripping through the countryside. We know they don't stay on the trail, we've all seen the swampy portion of the creek where human instinct said we have to rip that up. I think there are plenty of places for these people to

ride and we need to maintain our values of preserving nature while we enjoy it. To add to this noise would now come with chainsaws and logging equipment running through the great valleys. I know all too well what this sounds like, and its absolutely not how nature intended.

I've been told that protected species like grizzly bears aren't addressed in this plan. If this plan is to function for years to come, and we currently have a recovery region here, it should obviously be addressed. I realize we have a non-essential and experimental zone for grizzlies, but after seeing multiple bears now in the area, I feel like this wouldn't be much of an overall plan without addressing this. I am not one who believes in taming nature, and would rather see people in the wilderness that understand how to respect and be with nature. I have zero desire to remove all the predators so that we can always be at the top of the food chain. I would also like to see more focal species listed in this plan with goals and strategies for how to properly manage these species of concern as we move forward. Regarding logging and threatened/endangered species, I know that opening watersheds to increased levels of sunshine will increase temperatures, and I think the last thing our downstream fish populations of salmon, steelhead, etc. need is warmer water. There are also complications with these dry drainages not holding water and drying out even quicker. I think since we are trying to protect species like Bull Trout, that we should take these types of effects into consideration. On top of this is a reduction in water quality standards that I believe can in no way help our protected species. I can't imagine any good reasons why we would remove these quantitative standards from our guidelines unless we were planning on disregarding these guidelines for our own benefit. I won't dwell on this long, but I sure hope we plan on holding everyone accountable for their actions if logging is allowed. I know there are a lot of complications surrounding these types of decisions, but that comes with the job. I trust that you are good people, and we as citizens trust that you will make the right decisions for the right reasons.

We're running out of time; any help now can make a huge impact on the decisions that future generations have to make. To be honest if we think these decisions are hard, imagine what a real decision is going to look like in 50 years as we're all old or dead and these kids are trying to put this planet back together, or worse, have nothing left to put back together. Ultimately, I just really really really love our national forests, and I would literally cry seeing these lands turned into logged areas. I've seen it my whole life - once these lands are gone, they're gone. Thank you for your time.