COMMENTS

Old-growth plan on national forests

To whom it may concern, January 30, 2024

First off, having two major comment periods end at the same time is a cheap shot at the public discouraging their response.

The first question to be asked before a plan is developed is; How much old-growth is enough? The second question is: Are we going to protect all the varying types of old-growth stands even if they do not contribute to the qualities, you talk about in the plan?

Should we be protecting old-growth that is contributing to greenhouse gases?

Have you scientifically analyzed the difference in diversity of old-growth habitat and a managed forest consisting of all ages of timber?

Why should we trust your plan when you have failed to protect our forests from disasters under the NW forest plan?

Ecologically, socially, economically, and forest health wise, why do we need to grow more old-growth?

In a growing world and a world with dwindling resources can we ethically afford to tie up vast areas of forests that could increase poor forest practices in other countries? We are already importing pulp from the Brazilian rain forest to the state of Washington. The Forest service is a contributor to this irony.

An analysis of unintended consequences must be performed before a plan is made. The past performance of Forest Service plans has been full of unintended consequences for all the resources the service is supposed to protect, almost all of these consequences have had catastrophic impacts.

The Forest Service needs to get back to science and not be pushed by politicians and so-called environmental groups into fanciful ideas that have so far brought death and destruction to our forest, and social and economic downfall to our forest communities.

The incrementalism of making our forests into single use components, and ignoring the forest service Mato of multiple use most stop.

Respectfully,

Richard Whitmore

Forest engineer, retired

4214 Van Horn Lane

Bellingham WA. 98226