

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/13/2020 6:34:53 PM

First name: Sam

Last name: Box

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to strongly encourage a much more inclusive process for defining streams in the Nez Perce-Clearwater NF as being Wild and Scenic. Living in Missoula and Boise, I have spent hundreds of days exploring many of the streams considered under this proposed revision. The statements that so often appeared in suitable streams state that "no changes are expected to land use within the wilderness area," or "While dam construction is possible, it is unlikely." While no immediate changes are expected, recent land use decisions throughout America have indicated that the degree of protection for lands are often much more tenuous than we all realize. Just because there are no current threats does not mean that we shouldn't protect the streams to the best of our abilities. An analogy to this would be putting a seatbelt on in my car, before driving onto the highway: There are no current threats to me, but I recognize that there is a possibility for threats in the future, and by taking action now I can reduce the impact of future threats.

As a part of this logic, I encourage the drafters of this plan to, when a stream is suitable for the Wild and Scenic designation, to err on the side of designation. If a river is wild and scenic, why should it require a threat to receive its designation as Wild and Scenic?