

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/29/2024 10:28:58 PM

First name: Susan

Last name: Westervelt

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As a native Idahoan and daughter of a logger, I have seen vast expanses of our forests roaded and logged. I view the proposed forest plan for the Nez Perce/Clearwater National Forest as falling short of the protection it needs. The plan shows very little concern for the health and furtherance of the people's forest. I understand that one function of national forests is to generate money for the agency and people of the region, however, I do not understand the disdain for protection of vital aspects of the national forest in this plan. Idaho has some of the last intact wild and healthy national lands in the United States. I believe greater emphasis should be placed on protection of natural aspects and regeneration of public lands than this proposed plan promotes.

Every possible acre with wilderness qualification should be designated wilderness. In this plan, less than 17% of roadless country is recommended as wilderness - a pathetically small amount.

Healthy streams are crucial to healthy landscapes and fish habitat. By reducing these buffers by 50% you are all but guaranteeing negative impacts to stream quality, thus negative impacts to habitat for steelhead, salmon, lamprey, bull trout, and cutthroat.

The lack of protection for, and acknowledgment of the importance for, old growth forests is very short sighted. Once the old growth on public lands is gone, there will be no more for generations. The Forest Service is showing woefully little concern for the future of old growth in national forests for our children. These are national lands belonging to not just the current generations, but for many generations to come. This plan would allow old-growth forest to either be clearcut (total destruction), or "thinned", which can be damaging for decades. The proposed tripling of logging levels as proposed in the forest plan, would be to annihilate the people's forest as we know it, and would be the death knell for a number of forest species that are already in trouble, including goshawks, fisher, wolverine and other rare mammals. Talk of returning grizzly bears to their former range would be pointless.

The plan does nothing to address climate change. Carbon stocks are not measured by the plan, nor are the potentially massive carbon emissions from logging estimated or addressed.

Water quality, forest health, and wildlife habitat should be the most important considerations when writing a forest plan. Each is lacking. Please do a better job at addressing the protection of the people's forest.