

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/29/2020 2:01:21 AM

First name: Nancy

Last name: Clampet

Organization:

Title:

Comments: This unique and special part of Idaho has always been near and dear to my heart. In addition to its intrinsic beauty and value, it has been a part of my family's life, history and existence for over 120 years, through six generations and counting.

Alternative X is the predominant choice that I keep leaning toward through many of the components, primarily due to concerns about access and timber and not wanting a lot of country tied up in Wilderness designations. My primary area of focus and concern are those lands in the northern section, primarily the North Fork District since that is the area that I am most familiar with and feel comfortable in discussing.

Between fire having been excluded for so long, lack of logging, and death due to disease and insects, many areas are decadent, fuels-loaded and so again, Alternative X leans toward a higher timber output and more aggressive goals toward restoration, so that even if areas are not suitable for timber harvest, hopefully other means could be employed for rejuvenation.

Many of these categories and subtopics are interrelated, such as timber, fire and access. An on-going concern that I've had is when there IS a fire in there, roads have deteriorated to the point that access and/or escape, as well as firefighting, could be affected. Main thoroughfares are grown in to the point of no longer being two-lane roads and back roads are so brushed in and pot-hole as to be difficult at best and impassable on some.

The Scenic Integrity Objectives is an interesting category. Who doesn't want our forests to be scenic? I also understand that while working timber sales with logging, burning and restoration, there is a less-than-scenic period. But I would hope that it would be done in a manner that would quickly recover to a better state. Even in the areas marked as being a Low priority for Scenic Integrity, I would hope that it isn't an eyesore. I do remember when logging took place up Deadwood Creek, which is, by the way, one of the proposed "Low" priority areas. I was not impressed with the mess that was left and I can only hope, just because it is not on a main highway, that the resulting landscape would reflect a level of professional treatment, rather than a bomb site. The next options that I looked at were the Summer and Winter Recreation Opportunity Spectrums, which overlap with Wilderness recommendations. If they are not exclusive of each other, I would prefer Alternative X. We enjoy recreating on 4-wheelers and based on what I could discern from the maps and text, that alternative looks to have the smallest percentage of non-motorized area. We have trails and destinations that we enjoy traveling and would hate to have it deemed "non-motorized". Again, back to the Wilderness proposals, in all but X, there's too much.

With all the proposed wilderness, primitive and roadless areas, we would certainly hope that our access isn't cut off for all of the special destinations that we love. As I alluded to earlier, this is country that my family and generations before have packed into on horseback (before roads), worked in lookouts, pulled Ribes, fought fires, worked in the woods, mined, hunted, fished and taught the following generation to love and respect the land. I hope this process can help in that endeavor.