

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/20/2020 6:57:56 PM

First name: Kathleen

Last name: Kennedy

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear Forest Supervisor Probert,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Nez Perce-Clearwater Forest Plan Revision. When I became a biology teacher in St. Maries, Idaho in the late 1990's I discovered the Mallard Larkins and Great Burn proposed wilderness areas. While I no longer live in Idaho, I still teach biology in Western Montana and have continued to recreate in the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. A concept that has remained a cornerstone of my own education and my teaching is that of ecosystem services. The myriad of essential ecosystem services provided by our last remaining wild places are critical to our quality of life and increasingly even our species' survival. Intact ecosystems are essential in an era of climate change. For these reasons, I would like to voice my support for Alternative W.

Further, as someone who recreates frequently in areas designated as conservation lands in my home town, I am often disappointed by the actions of mechanized users. The user created trails and other impacts I see in my front country experience would not be consistent with maintaining wilderness character. Mountain bike use will expand exponentially in the Hoodoo if it is opened to mechanized use. These impacts will be difficult to mitigate would likely be irreversible. These impacts will also change the experience for existing users. While I know this constituency can assert itself in a way that holds processes hostage to their demands, I urge you to consider what these recommended wilderness areas will mean to future generations. Alternative W is the only alternative that will ensure that wilderness character is maintained.

Alternative X is unacceptable.

The boundary changes suggested in Alternative Y will invite trespass into areas that are not designated for motorized use. As technological advances expand the range and types of conditions accessible by snow machines, it is ever more important to have clearly delineated boundaries.

Alternative Z is concerning for its expansion of motorized and mechanized use. It is naïve to expect that these non-conforming uses would not set in motion a cascade of effects and jeopardize future wilderness designation.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the forest plan revision alternatives. I look forward to hearing your decision.