

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/24/2024 1:44:33 AM

First name: Chelsea

Last name: Liddell

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to object to the Nez Perce-Clearwater NFs Forest Plan Revision #44089. I specifically object to the removal of 17 rivers as eligible for Wild and Scenic protection, and the lack of inclusion as Wild and Scenic eligible 60 additional identified rivers with outstanding wild, scenic, and recreational value. The multi-use values of these rivers as Wild and Scenic-eligible streams, the ecosystem services value they provide by providing clean water to hundreds of thousands of people, and their ability to maintain protections while the forest is managed for multiple uses were not fully considered. Special interests, representing a very small fraction of those who receive value from the rivers, were given an outsize impact in making these decisions - the decision did not accurately represent a forest management plan for everyone. Furthermore, the Forest Service's justification for removing protections for streams are contradictory and lack merit. Wild and Scenic-eligible rivers have additional protections that are not guaranteed by their location in Wilderness areas, where, under some circumstances, roads may be built, logging can occur, or the river could be impounded. Furthermore, the plan fails to assign appropriate value to the continuous protection of a stream through multiple types of management jurisdiction. In order to protect the quality of water and a stream's value for both human recreation and wildlife habitat, it must be protected along its entire length - mismanagement in a single section of river can easily degrade the remaining length of that stream, making it unsuitable for habitat and recreation. Contradicting itself, the Forest Service states that in other areas, streams have too much protection, prohibiting multiple uses of the surrounding forest. First streams don't need protection, and now they have too much? This logic is inane, absurd, and cannot underlie a reasonable management plan. Additionally, well-conducted multiple uses can exist in the same areas as protected streams, as we see in areas like the Middle Fork of the Flathead river in Montana. To protect the forest's greatest ecosystem service, water quality, all forest activities around each of the 89 streams deemed potentially eligible for protection should be conducted in ways that maintain stream quality.

I specifically request that the plan be changed to retain interim protections for all 88 rivers that were deemed eligible during the study process.

Chelsea Liddell