

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/18/2020 11:04:43 PM

First name: Karen

Last name: Williams

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to comment on the Nez Perce Clearwater Forest Plan. We the people deserve meaningful input on how our forests are protected. The FS failed to analyze and include FOC's Citizen Conservation Biology Alternative in the draft plan. Why? This alternative is based on the best available science. The FS has indicated that any roadless areas not recommended as wilderness in the new forest plan could be developed (logged). These roadless areas are irreplaceable and provide some of the highest quality habitat. These areas should be recommended as Wilderness.

There are no quantitative standards for protecting watersheds and fish habitat in the new draft plan. Why??

The current plan has enforceable standards that the agency must adhere to.

The draft plan would allow logging in designated old growth, a departure from current standards that protect old growth habitat from development. Why?? Is old growth forest so common that it can be squandered??

Where is grizzly bear recovery in the new plan? This must be addressed.

In summary, the plan is deficient in attention to science-based management. Do better, for God's sake.