

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/28/2024 8:34:00 PM

First name: Kathleen

Last name: Benton

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Ms. / Mr. Reviewing Officer:

I am writing to object to the Nez Perce-Clearwater NFS Forest Plan Revision #44089. I object to this plan because it fails to protect wildlife and aquatic life including endangered and threatened species. My previous comments regarding the draft DEIS contained suggestions and comments are consistent with my current objections.

One of the greatest joys in my life is to have camped, hiked, backpacked and explored in the Nez-Perce Clearwater National Forest as well as many other public lands throughout the mountain west. The Nez-Perce Clearwater iNF is special for me because I live close to it and it contains areas of roadless wilderness. I object to this draft plan revision because it fails to adequately protect roadless areas, old growth, watersheds, fish and wildlife for the continued enjoyment of myself and others

This plan is deficient in many areas that provide the basis for my objection. These areas include wilderness designations of roadless areas, watershed and aquatic, wildlife, old growth and increased logging and climate change mitigation considerations.

This plan would be improved by designating all roadless areas as wilderness. It would be greatly improved by designating the Weitas Creek roadless area as wilderness, not dividing the Great Burn / Kelly Creek wilderness designation, including Elisabeth Lakes and adding wilderness designations to Fish and Hunger Creeks, Cove Mallard, The Gospel Hump additions and all other eligible roadless areas.

The plan revision would also be improved by increasing stream buffers and reestablishing sediment / embedded cobblestone standards in all watersheds to protect endangered or threatened Bull trout, salmon, steelhead, lamprey and cutthroat trout. Measurable standard for stream buffers and stream sediments contained in the current plans should be maintained if not improved in the revised new plan.

The current plan revision also fails to maintain old growth standards for protection. It would be an improvement to include the measurable and enforceable standard in the current plan and apply them to all forest types. The two 1987 plans have numerical standards to protect old growth, 10% forest-wide and 5% for each smaller watershed. These areas are currently off-limits to logging. Older fir-spruce forest, a common habitat in mid-elevation central Idaho, would have no protections under the new plan. This plan revision would be greatly improved and comply with The Biden Administration old growth executive order by including standards at least as good as the old plans.

I also object to this revised plans failure to adequately protect wildlife. This plan would be improved by including road density standards and establishing limitations on all motorized vehicle use to protect elk habitat. Road density standards and minimizing all motorized vehicle use will also protect grizzly bears, wolverine, lynx, fisher, and mountain goat habitat.

The single greatest objection I have to this plan revision is that it increases logging about 6 times more than the average amount logged in the last 24 years. Increased logging increases carbon emissions thus exacerbating climate change and negatively impacts all wildlife and fish habitat and forest types. Logging limits carbon sequestration, compacts soil, and emits more carbon than that resulting from large fires. Logging is not restoration and it does not limit fires. Fires are caused by human development intrusion and increased temperatures caused by carbon emission into the atmosphere. Logging cannot and should not be considered

restoration or fire prevention.

This plan revision is unacceptable because it decreases measurable standards that protect our public forest, wildlife and watersheds. This plan fails to protect endangered species and provide standards with which citizens can hold the Forest Service accountable for its management actions. This plan does not promote preservation and enjoyment of our forest for future generations. Thank you for consideration of my comments objecting to this forest plan revision.