

From: [Peter Reynolds](#)
To: [FS-appeals-northern-regional-office](#)
Subject: [External Email]Gold Butterfly Project Objection
Date: Wednesday, December 22, 2021 10:40:45
Attachments: [200TopClimateScientistCongressProtectForestsForCimateChange13May20.pdf](#)

[External Email]

If this message comes from an **unexpected sender** or references a **vague/unexpected topic**;
Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.
Please send any concerns or suspicious messages to: Spam.Abuse@usda.gov

Persons:

Redefining "old growth" is moving the goal post for the entire game which we are supposedly playing, which is how best to manage the forest for the good of all. "Good" in this case has to include provision of a viable habitat for human beings, as well as other creatures who live there, into the future.

The attached letter from 200 scientists to members of Congress states, "we must not only move beyond fossil fuel consumption but must also substantially increase protection of our native forests in order to absorb more CO2 from the atmosphere and store more, not less, carbon in our forests." It further states that, "Importantly, mechanical thinning results in a substantial net loss of forest carbon storage, and a net increase in carbon emissions that can substantially exceed those of wildfire emissions (Hudiburg et al. 2013, Campbell et al. 2012). Old growth trees store far more carbon the older they get, far surpassing the carbon stored by many smaller trees.

How did we get to a place where hearsay trumps scientific rigor in creating forest management policies, especially in 2021 when our survival as a species hinges on removing as much carbon from the atmosphere as we possibly can? We need to be preserving old-growth trees as a lifeline to the future, even as the forest floor and attendant small trees may need thinning to make up for decades of fire suppression.

You as a decision-maker at this critical time in history bear heavy responsibility for these policies you are about to enact. As a member of the public commenting on this action, I ask, "Why are you not following the science on this, especially as it pertains to exacerbating climate change?" You will have to answer this, not to me as I am 69 years old, but to your children and grandchildren.

Sincerely,

Peter Reynolds

