Randell and Mona Drake
19210 Pinehurst Rd
Bend OR 97703
jrmdrake@msn.com

January 28, 2024
Regional Forester
U.S. Forest Service
1220 SW 3rd Avenue
Portland, Or 97204

Comments to the 2024 NWFP Amendment

Attention: Regional Foresters

It is hard to understand why the US Forest Service, Department of Agriculture would submit this amendment to the 1994 failed Northwest Forest Plan. The new plan is almost certainly written by ***you and others*** who wear the same feathers in your cap as yesterday's writers prior to 1994 NWFP. Now you have included tribal and their past indigenous ancestors as being an acceptable and knowledgeable about forest health and management. Especially when they cannot even manage their own forests. Example the only Indian log mill in America is shut down and allowing thousands of acres of land to be burnt every year for decades. Very hard to grow seedlings and anything but invasive grasses by continuously burning mother earth to death yearly.

This amendment to the 1994 NWFP is a stacked deck against all forest users that have used the forest since the beginning of time. The people on this committee have a single goal and that is to preserve a forest ***without human*** management and humans using it daily. The words contained within the USFS amendment and their on-line statements on how the forest will be protected from us. The US Citizens will no longer have access for work or recreation, just simply preserving forested lands from us. Anything that continues using a motorized vehicle working the land or outdoor recreation by public will cease is their fondest dream. Which ones (including the writers of this amendment) are for allowing all users returning to forests to re-open the forest to public land users for work or recreation. This area is the greatest natural resource that dominates the Pacific Northwest landscape. These lands within the Department of Agriculture state that forested lands are a unique renewable resource and with the proper management and stewardship could and can be a continued source of monies for USFS operation and American citizens.

Which ***others*** mentioned in your amendment supports all forested lands being managed for all aspects of humans for working the land or all aspects of outdoor recreation. From harvesting all trees under the 200 years old, removing all dead and dying standing or fallen, grazing to control invasive weeds and grasses, controlling grasses that will become tinder as spring turns to summer from lack of grazing, building and creating roads throughout the forest lands for fire breaks, for all to access the forest for work or play, having tens of thousands of roads open for fire fighters, emergence crews and search and rescue to access all parts of the forest quickly, for roads maintained in great shape as were in yesteryears, supporting dead end roads left open for all forest users to use, support dispersed camping throughout the forest, roads throughout the forest to gather fire wood, forest foods that grow in season, supporting using mechanical means and getting dead and dying trees out of the forest, clearing the dead fall from the forest floor particularly clearing drainage to control erosion in natural drainages, clearing all dead and dying, replanting the landscape immediately after burnt, insect killed and diseased trees are removed, trees dead standing or laying need removed quickly making room for seedlings and natural grasses, and above all promoting removing marketable trees from the forest at a sustainable harvest rate dying, dead or alive. Is there even one promoting motorized access to all parts of the forest especially for the ***disable, sick and elderly***? Where is it written that the disabled, sick and elderly will have motorized access to all old growth forests. To drive amongst the forest from Washington to Northern California. Which person is promoting any of the above; we need to know. We do hope the majority of the USFS personnel are.

Stopping all burning of forests to control the forest from being ***fuel laden.*** Instead of burning for removal of fuels from the forest re-start grazing by domesticated animals, mechanical means or by hand. It is understood that the necessity of removal of underbrush, invasive weeds, and overgrowth of plants but instead of fire use grazing, mechanical means or by hand. Controlled burns or forest fires contribute to global warming both need stopped. The smoke from both contributes to plants, animal, and human health problems. Days and days of smoke have and do prevent plants from growing in the forest and upon agricultural lands. Many plants become stunted, do not produce seeds, fruit or just die prematurely. After so many days of smoke in the air many plants volunteer to end their life cycle for the year. The USFS need to actively stop all unnecessary smoke in the air as quickly as possible. Clearing the land by fire is unacceptable!

No more controlled burns destroying thousands of species that live on/in the ground. Really curious how many thousands of animals you have burned to death with controlled burns. To be burned alive on purpose is not acceptable within any amendment that supposedly is all about saving a few birds. Which have also been burnt to death as they did not flee (or not at all) far and were overcome by smoke.

It is not clear in the amendment how much land will be burnt by fire to protect the old growth timber. After it is all burnt is the USFS going to be able to control the lighting and embers from landing in old growth forest better than they have since 1994? Perhaps large roads around and through the timber patch with fire crews standing ready 24/7. It

would seem that a NWFP would be very specific how exactly the trees 200 years old will be protected to save approximately 1600 NSO or is it pairs? Not trying to be smart here, there is just a better way to protect the species.

It should be written somewhere that the USFS will harvest the land prior to controlled burning. If the effect is to really control underbrush by burning, then harvest all trees prior to the burn then replanting. Leaving at least 20-30 percent dying in the controlled burn is unacceptable. At least the tree living animals would have been chased to other parts of the forest. Fire is not acceptable practice and the USFS need to find other ways.

Working to make spacing of trees for maximum growth by mechanical or by hand needs to be within all 10–30-year plans. This amendment is supposedly for 30 years and like the 30 years prior it most likely will be the end of giant forests in the Pacific Northwest. Someone in the amendment must address that tree growing is the business of the Department of Agriculture. Growing trees is the USFS purpose not a sideline that is done every third or fourth year. It is a disgrace that new seedlings are now planted on an average 5-7 years after a tree killing event. Why is it not written how the USFS will go back into the tree growing business? Who is responsible for spelling out that USFS is planning to reforest the forest starting in the morning and continuing till all available lands are replanted. Where is that person writing within the 30-year plan at and why are the words not contained within this document. It is assumed that this plan will be in favor of healthy growing forests. Is it not?

Protecting the forest is also the job of the USFS. How much of the forest have you allowed to be destroyed by fire accidentally or purposefully in controlled burns. How many forest plants have you allowed to die by not treating diseased and plant killing insects. These things should be included within this amendment, so the public knows how many acres have already been destroyed by the lack of not protecting our forest legitimately. What is the current rate that forest plants have been destroyed since 1994 NWFP particularly because of the plan itself. It needs to be written why the USFS is not aggressively changing this. Nothing in this amendment will change this. How are you stopping the plant killing disease from reaching the living asap? How are you stopping plant killing insect from reaching the living plants asap? Where is it written that even the smallest fires will be put out quickly instead of being allowed to grow into massive infernos? Even if you aggressively attack each of the above some of the forest is going to be dead. The dead and dying will add up and amount to a large total of dead plants and animals. Is the USFS aggressively going to put fires out and start immediately treating infected areas? Would the area of dead and dying not be tens of thousands of acres less if the USFS became actively engaged in doing so. So why are you not? That needs to be written down and included in the amendment. The US Citizens need to understand why the USFS is not taking care of our forest.

Not standing up to previous lawsuit that has and will result in millions of trees to burnt down, killed by disease, and insects is important part of forest management. Is this going to change within the new forest plan? We, the American citizens hold you

accountable for not using all of your tools to protect our public lands. These trees alive have a value to us and not standing up to lawsuits has allowed millions of forest plants and animals to be destroyed. These lawsuits are at the heart of the demise of the forested lands. This amendment should spell out each time the USFS has done everything it can to protect the forested lands, but the environmentalist has sued the USFS stopping the needed management. This needs to be included in any new forest plan. We need this information spelled out! The ability to protect our public lands from being burnt down, diseased and infected by insects ***as soon as possible*** has to be written in the new forest plan. These lands need immediate response within weeks not years to protect them from becoming the dead and dying. If any groups oppose this, it must be mentioned and how they are particularly stopping the USFS from doing its job. It is a ridiculous reason most of the time to stop the USFS from managing our public lands. Why not just put them in charge and disband the USFS. Let the public understand why their public lands are not being productive. Why there is millions of dead and dying plants standing or lying dead to rot away.

Is the USFS going to wait until our public lands become a wasteland that is only good for blowing sand like the Sahara Desert. What is a USFS job useful for if not to protect our public lands from those who want our public lands not to be for humans. Burnt to the ground is sadistic and those who approve of this should be jailed just as any arsonist is. People who stop the USFS from treating the forest from dying from insects or disease should be held accountable and prosecuted for the knowledgeable destruction of a living natural resource. It is foolish to create a 10–30-year plan with exactly the same outcome again and again. It is the USFS standing in the shadows wringing their hands as the environmentalist stands with the mike in hand, smiling, and proudly announcing again how they stopped you from managing the forest properly again. This is wrong and they need exposed and opposed with the USFS standing with the mike with firmly planted feet on the ground with ***real management being justified***.

What is the purpose of individuals and entities to write our concerns, objectives and encouragement on any parts of the 2024 Amendment to the NWFP. The ***others*** will most likely sue to stop any changes as written. Threating or suing the USFS even if a million have voiced or written opposing views to this amendment. We are tired of making our voices heard and writing comments only to have (after USFS face to face meeting with us) the USFS forced behind closed doors and our concerns, objection or encouragement overridden without a word of our opposition put into action. Just a new plan that writes out our concerns, objection and encouragement right out the door. This is very wrong and must be stopped.

This process behind closed doors prior and after needs to stop with environmental groups. Forest management needs to be by the people not those who coerced the USFS their way or else. It is why so many do not comment as it does not do any good. If this is going to be allowed for the next 30 years what is the purpose of the USFS. This is wrong! If someone coerced me behind closed doors it is illegal, and the law is informed. Threating a lawsuit and forcing the USFS to do as they say is wrong and the dead and dying plants and animals keep on growing. Threating a lawsuit to get their

way has to stop and it needs to stop at the USFS office not allowing them through the door. The USFS is the one responsible for the US Forest. It must stand its ground when it is for all the people and especially for forest health. Every voice and letter should be a viable reason for enacting change, and it must include the majority.

Show us where it is written by USFS and is well worded that US Citizens (not forest advisory committee) will manage the forest service as directed by all forest users. Show us where it is written that the forest service will manage the forest input from all user groups. The USFS is not the owners of the forested lands throughout the Pacific Northwest. We the people are supposed to decide for you how the forests are to be managed as a group of users. The USFS is allowing a committee that dictates how you (through lawsuit after lawsuit) will manage the forest or else. This entire amendment is written by just one user group mentality that is anti-access for all other user groups. This amendment should be completely thrown out as only one user group was allowed to input what and how the USFS will/must write the amendment excluding these lands belonging to the people. Pretending they know what is best for the lands is not true. They have a purpose and that is to remove you and us from what was public land. This amendment should have sought out our input prior and all forest user types brought to the table to write an amendment. This is wrong!

We agree that the 1994 NWFP needs to be amended (or removed entirely) but only if it is written by all user groups and not a single ideology from a single group of users. A user group that is anti-access to all working and using the forest is not acceptable. Having a healthy and growing forest is our goal not theirs. This group cannot sit at the table and work solutions as a part of a committee of all forest users. If the committee of all makes a decision, they (as they have done many times) after the meeting would and do go behind closed doors and threaten lawsuits instead of yielding to the majority's decision. If they cannot work within the room of their peers, they should have no place at the table. They certainly should not be allowed to influence the USFS in any way. This is not foresting management but allowing a very narrow-minded group to dictate to the USFS and the Citizens of the United State how it will be done or else. This ideology cannot continue as it currently is. The USFS has allowed this narrow-minded group to become a committee and you are accepting their one-sided group writing/opinions spelling out a new amendment. The same words that doomed the 1994 NWFP. It is wrong using only their words to write this document. This must not be how the forest service operates any more. It is time for change, and it is time that true skilled management returns to the office of US Forest Service. It is time to throw out this amendment and start anew and begin a new era.

See if there is even one that is for controlling (other than human access) the number of non-native invasive species to these lands or not. Is there even one that understands and is advocating that an invasive species must have its number reduced within the amendment or on-line. Their plan is not a viable nor acceptable plan. What is their plan? Same as the failed 1994 NWFP. Through the amendment USFS will keep increasing the habitat for one species. The logic did not work prior to January 25, 2024, and it will

only result in increasing the habitat for the invasive species as well to prolificate all the rest of the forests in the Pacific Northwest forests. Where is it in the amendment or any online committee person that is advocating that the primary way to save the NSO is by destroying or controlling the numbers of the invasive species? With even more habitats it will grow at exactly the same rate since 1994 NWFP. Eventually (as now proposed in the amendment) by the order of natural selection of the fittest the NSO will become extinct. Simply by not using knowledgeable information and using it to save the NSO. Using this flawed amendment within the next 30 years the NSO will fly no more in the United Sates Forest. They will be extinct. This is wrong! There are plenty of old growth forests currently but not for both. Which one are you going to grow, and which one needs controlled? Apparently, no one has contacted wildlife management and learned how to control invasive species. This should have been done 30 years ago.

USFS Forest Advisory Committee is not complete! It only has units on it that are in contrast to all management practices that have a history of working. Practicing on the grounds of real management and stewardship that works is not within the committee. The USFS has allowed them to move the failed 1994 NWFP forward without representation of all the people being a part of this committee. Representation of all user groups are not being include only a selected user group. A specific handpicked group that stands against any and all true management practice that would actually create healthy forests and truly protect the NSO. A group of humans that believe that it is us the Citizens of the United States that are the INVASIVE SPECIES. Our forests are not healthier now than before 1994 NWFP was put into effect. This is wrong! The point is the results will be the same failed non-management of our national forest here again in the Pacific Northwest forest and another extinct animal. Our national treasure will continue to die and be burnt down.

Nowhere is it written how the population of the United States has grown since 1994. In record numbers we are now visiting the forested public lands now more than ever. Our access must be included in any amendment. Our increased use of public lands must be a major part of any new NWFP. How we are currently using public lands has changed. It is wrong to continue forcing how we use the forest today for recreation based on 30 years ago. Ninety-seven percent of all forest users are using OFF HIGHWAY VECHLES TO ACCESS THE FOREST. After entering the forest the OHVs are continued being used throughout the forest. Every road, way, route and trail are now overused but nothing in your amendment concerns increasing more access. Surely the USFS can see that there needs to be a solution other than denying OHV additional lands to recreate on. The NWFP amendment must be completely re-written and this time by the people not a selected like-minded individuals.

The USFS is forcing upon us to re-use the same OHV areas over and over again. Not allowing them to grow. These areas are very popular and outdoor recreation in an OHV has grown considerably. Yet not a single word within this amendment OHV growth in numbers and type of machines has increased considerably. These exact OHV areas have no true maintenance just pounding the existing trails. If the OHVs and people using them have changed then the lands for their use must change as well. It is wrong

not to include how OHVs are being used for outdoor recreation within public lands. It is wrong not to maintain these OHV areas keeping within the standards of the authorized build. It is wrong due to increasing number of users not to increase the OHV recreational area. It is wrong of the USFS for not understanding the four classifications of OHVs and their individual needs. So many just want to ride through the forest with their families. No particular place to go, camp, picnic etc. just a perfect outdoor activity within the forest.

All over the world, nations are planting trees to remove carbon from the air and storing them in TREES. Planting trees in spaces that have had no trees for generations. Trees in every open space of ground that has never held tree roots. What is the reason; the world needs trees that are young and healthy as they are the best carbon eaters. Report after report shows that the maturing trees and old growth trees are adding more carbon to the planet than they are removing. Ignoring the rotting foliage on the ground from each old growth tree is part of the carbon growth problem in the world. There is no mention of anything about how and what you are doing to join the world slowing carbon growth. Why is it not written that the USFS is doing its part in decreasing carbon gas emissions within the amendment to the NWFP of 1994. How dedicated is the USFS making our forest the largest carbon eater and storage of carbon in the world. What is wrong with that plan? Is it somewhere within the writing that for the next 30 years the USFS will remove every dead and dying plant to make room for planting carbon eaters that work all by themselves? Where is it written that the USFS will manage the forest for a healthy growing forest that will help slow or even stop global warming. The Pacific Northwest Forest could contribute considerably to carbon storage if managed properly. The plan should be simple remove all the dead dying from the forest and re-plant. It is a continuous cycle and is done daily, weekly, monthly and yearly never ending. This needs to start today!

The dead and dying standing or not and living trees too small to make into lumber need not burnt. Trees and brush removed for many reasons need to be chipped not burned in slash piles. Wooden plant-based forest materials chipped and is used for fuel produces less carbon when burnt in electric producing plants and are marketable. Chips from whole plants can be used for erosion control, dust control, parking areas, pit-toilet areas, pathway in animal (including humans) traffic areas, and staging areas etc. Clean wood chips from whole trees and limbs can easily be chipped into material for wood milled products. Chips from whole plant materials spread on the forest floor which will become tree food much quicker than whole wooded plant material. Whole plant chips can be used for pellets and bio-wood bricks which burn much cleaner than sticks of wood (approximately 10% cleaner fuel). The warmth of fire in homes will never go away as it is in our DNA to bask in true wood heat. Where fires have burnt into the old forest floor leaving behind acres of barren land, tons of carbon holding wood chips could be spread. Plant based whole chips will aid the new seedlings to grow quickly. The chips and needles spread upon the land will quickly become the new soil in burnt out areas. The priority here is to get the dead land growing green again and not burning anything.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The amendment does mention that where fires, disease and insects have killed large areas of trees over 200 years old there is no longer NSO. What it does not mention is when this happened the NSO just flies (if both mates still live) to the younger living trees and proceeded to live their lives quite well. Report after report has pointed out the flawed information concerning the NSO, the USFS even agrees to this. This amendment is still using the flawed information that the NSO needs old growth forest and now you have added mature trees. These animals just need a tight small, larger-treed thicket to nest in. A couple of trees need to be sparsely limb for these birds to see out easily. They are not fighters but are flee-errs. Any bird flies in, they flee whether a predator or not. The reason they flee is it is their survival instincts and to protect their young. If it is a predator, it will follow them away from their home tree. Their food source is the surrounding forest that must let sunlight in and be sparsely planted. That is simple, that is where the small rodents they feed on live abundantly. The majority of rodents do not live in old growth forest unless ***well-spaced apart***. Rodents love sunshine, whether the ground or trees are their homes. The point here is they just need a tree, sparsely limbed, with long limbs, preferably keeping a dry place close to the trunk. It does not care what age the tree is just a preferred place to alight and flee ***quickly*** from.

By the way what is a mature tree? Is it 71 years old, 102 years old, 134 inches around, just days before it dies? This needs to be clearly defined and accepted by all forest districts and the American people using the forests. It is our intention that there is no such definition as the environmentalist will only use it to shut down more forests than ever before. I know in my corn field the corn must be picked days before the plant matures; then it dies. It is evident that all trees are maturing yearly, just growing away all by themselves. They quit growing when killed by fires, disease or insects that could have been prevented. The three items just mention kill more trees within forests on public lands than any other reasons as currently managed since 1994. Then they are just left to rot away. Very, very wrong the latter sentence is and the USFS allowing this is to blame. The words mentioning mature trees should not be any new NWFP as there are plenty of old growth trees. All trees from 30 years to 199-year-old trees should only be considered for harvest. The harvested tree boundaries should be right to the tree line of 200-year-old treed forest.

You mention that per your committee and others that climate change is occurring due to carbon emissions. Where in the writing of the amendment does it mention how many metric tons of carbon that is being emitted due to dead trees and foliage lying on the forest floor. Within your amendment there is not even a word to tell us how the USFS plans to remove all dead and dying trees laying down from the forest to control carbon emission. What it is doing to make room for replanting new. Every school child is taught that dead trees take up space shading the lands around them, stopping or slowing growth of plants considerably. Dead and dying trees callout to the very disease and insects that will destroy what few are living. Killing undead trees by the thousands. There is no plan written which will stop diseases and insects that will continue to kill natures carbon eaters. Leaving perhaps close to a million plus acres dead and dying. Where is your plan to change this? Will you actively start doing all you can by treating

the living before they are dead plants? We will join you in this treatment plan to save every living tree that will help prevent global warming. It is apparent that the USFS needs ***us***; not the current committee or the forest will continue to turn browner and browner. Without us; the carbon counters that were placed within the living forest will rise as the forests continue to die as they have since 1994.

These massive acres of dead and dying are where these infernos get their primary fuel. The fast-growing underbrush choking out the few seedlings that survive and horrifically adding to the forest laden fuels supply. What are you doing about this in your amendment? That would be active forest management to protect every living plant still standing in the forest whether it is marketable or not. Where is your commitment to doing this written? Are you not the keepers of a healthy, maximizing the growth of a living forest? Where is written that the US Forest Service the Department of Agriculture should not do all it can in removal of the dead and dying in millions of trees on federal lands? ***It seems to so many that the USFS should be held accountable for not managing a healthy forest.*** Sorry, how the USFS has managed the forest since 1994 is not working nor acceptable. Change must happen within the USFS at the front door to the few still working within our national forest.

Where is it mentioned that you will ***aggressively*** stop and attack fires when they are first kindled, tree killing insects as soon as they are identified, and air or root borne diseases to stop them dead in their tracks. Where is your plan to get these dead and dying trees out of the forest and market to the hungry lumber yards of the Pacific Northwest. Removing all dead and dying out of the forest immediately to prevent the living trees from catching their deaths. Dead and dying timber moved quickly out of the forest, enabling the highest markable value so monies from the sale have the highest economic value. Managing the forest is going to require considerable monies to rectify the current miss management and implement considerable hands-on management and that is going to be expensive. It will take every available monies received from dead, dying, and living harvested to undo the 1994 NWFP. Having new seedlings on hand to put new seedlings into the ground within months. Which will start growing into a new forest within months instead of many years from now (currently 5-7 years average). Millions of carbon eaters require very little upkeep. Just need their roots in the soil unhindered by dead and dying standing or laying on their side. Guaranteeing the fastest growth by spacing the baby trees where the dead and dying once stood. Shredding some of the dead and dying plant material on the forest floor for the young trees to have ample natural fertilization.

Dead and dying just rotting away for decades. Each as it rots away adding to the carbons already supposedly killing our planet as written in USFS amendment pages. Carbons now loosen and free; having no living trees to store the carbons into which is natural in nature. Only the living trees store carbon the dead rotting gives it up. Should it not be the USFS prioritized commitment to making every acre within their lands a living forest?

This is wrong and ***anyone championing this should not be listened to***! The past decision in the 1994 NWFP cannot be re-used in the amendment as they are the same. The almost exact words in the 2024 NWFP will result in non-management of the forests that are left. Turning millions more forested lands into infernos. USFS must make a 180-degree turn and get back to what actually has worked in the past. Remember there was no massive fire prior to 2002 or so. After that every fire fueled by the dead and dying intensified by the lack of proper forest management. Which can be directly blamed on the 1994 NWFP, lawsuits and threated lawsuits. Someone has to take the bull by the horns and look at what really worked the hundred years prior to 1994. Our fathers apparently were better at forest management than are being credited for by the current forest management tenfold. Their management and stewardship of the forest needs a very hard look at more than it is currently. Apparently, they were managing the forest considerably better than after 1994.

Until the 1994 NWFP was put into effect the forests were alive with activity. Men and the local communities they live in depended on the forest natural resources ***marketable trees dead, dying or alive***! The roads from the small communities were well maintained. Mechanical equipment from all over America could be on the worksites in most cases overnight up and in full operation. Not because men of that time were better workers but the road systems from Level 4 to Level 1 were continuously kept up. (The death of the Level I roads have contributed considerable to lack of managing forests or is it the day it began) Every forest in the Pacific Northwest had millions of dollars from trees harvested to keep these roads up.

The moment a fire was kindled the entire logging crew was there putting it out, not the forest service in most cases. One was always left behind to make sure it stayed dead out, rarely was the forest service involved at all other than just notification to the many lookouts. Men loved the forest as it was and that it put food on the table and a roof over their heads. The equipment needed was already in the woods, and it took very few hours, and the fire was dead out. Were they trained fire fighters? Not really, they just understood that every tree that burnt took monies out of their income. The dead and dying trees have value but the living trees have considerably more.

Why has the USFS taken the majority of its people who worked in the forest and put them at a desk in buildings miles from the forest? Where once hundreds of USFS personnel were seen by us as the workers went about their task. Today one rarely sees one out in the forest. Why is this? How many millions and millions of dollars have been spent on planning projects, doing SOPA, EA, ESA, NEPA and starting projects just to have environmentalists walk through your front door either threatening or their lawyers suing and stopping them cold. The American public needs too know this is where the majority of the USFS expense are consumed. Months of work stopped dead. Harvesting of trees stopped dead with thousands of logs cold deck alongside roads. Just stopping the sale long enough that the trees dead, dying or cold decked have no further value to no one, not even a family scrounging for firewood. We have a right to know just what the tax paying citizens have spent within the USFS for nothing. It needs to be written out every penny that the environmentalist has cost this nation. How many trees they have

caused to die by forcing the USFS to stop good management and stewardship of our forests. We need to and have a right know how many millions have been lost just as smoke is lost to a stiff breeze.

The forest plan of 1994 killed this within years. As forest agency after forest agency was sued to stop logging which was the intent of environmental groups frpm the get go. It was never about NSO, it was just a guise to stop all logging. This is wrong and the USFS should not continue with this amendment. I am not a psychic but if it becomes the law of the land all the habitat of all the forest inhabitants will be without any trees to live in.

The infernos are not the result of global warming but a simple slack of good stewardship of USFS lands and it is apparently at this time a forgotten practice. It can easily be traced by the lack of knowledgeable human forest service or men working the land are no longer present. Every man with a shovel and their mechanical equipment is just not there. Not all were logging, many were building and maintaining roads, mapping out future tree sales, marking out boundaries of the sale which requires walking in the woods, figuring the trees for sale in the forest, walking through the forest looking for disease and insects that might kill the trees they managed, making sure domesticated animal stayed within their allotment, building fences for allotments, removing brush by hand or mechanical means, etc. Where are those USFS workers at? So many stayed up to a month at a time in the forest where they worked. Have they been tied to their desk with paperwork mostly brought on by environmentalists? If it is not written in the amendment that this will change, then it will be exactly same as the 1994 NWFP.

USFS is being misled by some who are allowed to be a part of your advisory committee. It is important that the truth is realized here and considered valid. My wife and I are descendants of indigenous people mixed in with those of European descent. The need for you to understand the truth is important to forest health of the past.

Although our grandparents, father and mothers have never been part of a solvent nation or reservation, we have learned from them. This example of real life within the forested landscape is exact. When we were little, our place was understood. The men and older brothers went hunting and the women and younger children tended the camp. Our first job was rounding up firewood for cooking and warming. At first this was easy, just steps away from the firepit were many twigs, dry grasses and low hanging branches. For three days or so our job was very easy but as the days wore on it became quite a challenge to find dry woodened material. It must be understood that we were not allowed to use axes, hand saws or mechanical means to gather wooded material that lay within the forest. By the beginning of the second week we were using ropes to pull larger and larger downed trees to camp as all the little limbs from the downed timber had been used. Dragging them into camp where just the butt was placed in the fire pit and the little firewood was placed against them or between them. This allowed our mothers to cook on. By the end of the third week the children present had to make a considerable circle around camp to keep the fire going through the day and early evening. The forest ground for a least a quarter to half a mile was cleared of all dead

underbrush that we could pull free from the ground. By the end of the third week there was not a single piece of wooded material left to be found close to camp. The dried grass we had tied into bundles for starting the dead out campfire were nowhere to be found within our camp site. We cleared the forest at each camp site and rarely camped there again. This was two to three families. Imagin if you can what it would have been like for a camp of ten or more families, spending the summer gathering the edible foods within the forest lands.

The trails that would have been used to water, away from camp to use in a quiet way and the men going to and frow out into the forest hunting for meat. We in camp, them out looking for meat. How much land we used within our simple group of forest users. Nothing motorized or mechanized and how the earth must have looked when we left sometimes in the fourth week. Maybe 3 or 4 tents, a space away from the fire pit for our wood gathering for the day, cooking area, cleaning area for game processing, area around the fire pit to huddle up to and a lean-to covering up our provision. This was a fairly big area of land that was used each time. Two to three cars that brought us to the magical enchantment of public forest used by many. Again think how the forest lands would have looked with ten or more families living the entire winter there. I can assure the men would have joined us dragging any and all trees for miles into camp. Some dried dead trees would have broken into, and others burnt into manageable links to be dragged into camp as it was the only source of heat and most importantly cooking.

I can assure the USFS the camps were moved up and down the streams of the Pacific Northwest out of necessity. Each little creek if running was used and small dams were built to make a small pool enabling water to be dipped, washing cooking utilities, washing clothes, and washing us. Playing in these small streams and catching the small fish for food were a favorite past time.

Wood products from the forest floor were gathered from the smallest twig to the largest was consumed by us for making things, keeping warm and for cooking. When it was used up it was time to move, and the process was repeated over and over for thousands of years by those who came before us. The forest floor, branches as high as could be reached, brushed of all dead and dying wooded material was removed for survival in all the Americans. The forest was not laden with fuel to burn as our ancestor had and were using every dry wood scrape that was within their grasp.

This fallacy that our ancestors left wooded material lying unused is not true. They used every scrap of the dead and dying daily. The underbrush was trampled, and some was used but if it could be pulled it was used for something. In some of their trips to and from camps limbs and small trees were piled against tree trunks left to dry for when we returned months later. Why has the USFS turned their backs to good forest management and stewardship and leaving the forest laden with unburnt fuel for a small fire to turn into an inferno? It is the dead, dying trees and the brush left to grow after fires, diseased and insect killed trees that is 100% cause of infernos.

Whenever we came back to an area it could be seen by all there would be new trees growing abundantly in the clearings. This clearing and the surrounding forest edges were unburnt as there was nothing left to burn when we left. The forest was our source of food as well as the clearing being a place to live. The clearing left behind a few years ago had already begun to grow new grass, brush and even tree seedlings. Tree seedlings were now growing alongside the trails into the forest. The seeds that had been dropped about our previous encamp had sprouted. The once barren campsite was growing into sustainable plants. This required a campsite not quite in the same area each time or camping in the same exact spot. Either way the camping spot within days became a clearing man made not by fire but just feet on the ground. Removing the natural resource on the ground till it was all used up.

We were taught to keep away from the new seedlings as they had value and one day, they would be a new forest harboring our edible foods within the forest. My uncle would walk along pulling up a small tree then walk a short distance with his long legs and pulling up another repeatedly. He was intentionally giving each tree the distance it needed to grow quickly. To this day I do the same thing understanding what he said in which trees bunch together slows their growth. Young saplings were considered a very valuable commodity. Many things would be made from them and with no metal blades they could be cut down another way. It did take some time but again with the help of the younger ones it was accomplished. If you wonder how this was done there is a place within Central Oregon of such an encampment that has been almost untouched. A person should not wait long however as the earth is reclaiming its own and soon their will not be evidence of the Indigenous encampment. The younger trees were very valued then as they should be today. Leaving them in piles and burning is no longer acceptable.

The value of each clearing is the same today as it has been for thousands of years. Within your amendment there is no mention of how important clearings are within the forest. Sitting around your desk it is pretty apparent food for grazing animals is lost to reality. Where is the majority of food for grazing found? Is abundant grass growing on the forest floor shielded from sunlight amongst true old growth forests? Where is it found written within the amendment? It does mention that grazing within old growth forest needs consider, really. Apparently, it needs to be pointed out to the USFS that in a real old growth forest there are almost no plants within the massive driplines of the foliage above. With the exception of mushrooms there is very little fodder for wild or domesticated animals to be had in a 200 year or older forest. In the hot summer months animals of all types may find and do make beds amongst the rotting needles and discarded branches but they are not there to graze. There is very little to graze on, however, in an old growth forest. Apparently, someone has mistakenly a young forest that is sparsely planted by man or nature as that is where the grasses for grazing can be found. Beyond the drip lines, between trees and underbrush can be found some plants to be grazed upon.

It is the clearings of acres to hundred acres plus that one will find most animals grazing. Not too big or another invasive species will be having them for dinner. Particularly

around the edges unless someone left areas of brush within the clearing. Then perhaps a few will dare foraging further into the center. If the goal was to really enhance the livelihoods of forest animals' thickets of smaller trees surrounded by open space would be ideal. An example of real upmost usefulness would be small thickets less than an eighth acre (not big trees) or less surrounded by a hundred acres or more. twenty or so thickets per open patch perhaps. There must be a large open area to sustain a herd of elk or deer. As each need to be able to see around themselves as their primary line of defense is to flee from invasive species that will have one or more dead. This again is short term only as each clearing either needs maintained as a clearing or new trees planted and clearing once again becoming a forest. The latter being ideal, and the clearings moved continuously throughout the forested lands. For many reasons the forest animals travel from grassy area to grassy areas. It is very interesting that a new clearing will be used considerably by more animals than one that is seven or eight years old. It is believed by many that the young grasses and brushes are the most desirable food source. As it matures the domesticated animals move in eating the tinder that can easily spark fires. they can spend days or weeks mowing down the taller grasses where wild animals will not. Then magically the large forest animals return in the spring for a time if the taller grasses have been eaten down. As the clearing ages fewer and fewer animals will come to that part of the forest. Animals do not come to an old growth forest to graze as very little of anything to graze upon. Humans, deer and elk do graze upon mushrooms under their canopies but there is insignificant grass for grazing.

Grazing of wild or domesticated animals within the forested district will reduce wildfires significantly is a very true statement. Open lands must be available for grazing or as can be seen the wild animals move where there are open areas to graze upon. Many deer and elk are forced to graze within city limits and upon agriculture lands as there is insufficient open lands within forested lands. Once when logging was within every forest district the lands were opened up and grasses seemingly grew over night. Apparently just waiting for sunlight to flourish into life. Wild animals of all types came to graze and gather tree cones within days of the start of logging. The wild animals are drawn to these newly logged areas for a reason and not to forests killed by the 1994 NWFP. These logged open areas support plant life and renewed animal life within days after the first trees are felled. This does not happen after a fire that has scorched the earth and killed every living thing.

Removing trees is very important to forest health. All trees that have reached a size that actually will enable the USFS to make a return on should be sold. Too big or too small they are worth less and marketing trees having the highest value should always be the primary consideration when to harvest. So many question that living trees need harvested but living healthy forest lands when cleared provide considerably more to the new plants and animals will be very abundant. This is not true of a dead forest by fire, disease or insect killed. Eventually after decades the dead forest will once again take over the land and the trees can be seen through the underbrush. Logging in a sustainable practice will be twenty times heather and will promote a forest to be ready for harvest in many areas in less than 30 years. The logging debris, the tracks turning the old soil with the new, seeds are spread upon fertile lands it just grows quicker and

the animals will come of all types seemingly overnight. It is clearly wiser to utilize logging verse letting the forest to be killed. A logged area will produce more trees with considerably less efforts by human involvement than a forest killed by fire, disease, and insects. This needs to be within your amendment how harvesting benefits the forest. Continuing the natural life cycle much quicker and a sustainable forest starts new life within months verse decades of a dead forest.

The economics of removing the living is considerably greater than the dead and dying. There is value in the dead and dying if remove especially before rot begins. Once the needles drop from the boughs the value decreases immensely. The point here is logging a forest that is living in a controlled and sustainable way will add to the rural communities enabling themselves to exist. The dead and dying is an event that has to be reacted to but a real sold unit to be logged off at a giving rate will prosper the rural community for years. Planning their lives around a well-managed forest that includes logging is a boon to all including the workers, USFS, and the citizens living in these rural communities. The tree sales are important, but it is the workers living in the community that will truly sustain the community. If rural communities are doing well so is America.

The last part of this is the USFS must have it in writing within the amendment that once the sell is lent nobody can walk through their back door and threaten to sue or directly sue to stop the sale. The USFS says it will open additional area to logging is falling on deaf ears. Since the prior NWFP of 1994 there has been less than 10 percent of the most valuable trees harvested, left the forest and actually made it to the mills. The tiny scab trees have been sold but their value was so small they still lay rotten away throughout the forest of the Northwest. The stopping of these sales must stop! Someone needs to respond positively to the fact that harvesting and replanting provides an excellent healthy growing forest. Healthy forests are the homes to healthy animals and plant ecosystems and must be promoted.

It is apparent that the USFS has forgotten that trees are not only carbon eaters but provide clean breathable air for humans and animals. Oxygen production is also a part of healthy trees just doing their thing without anyone's help. This alone should stand as testimony to young healthy trees covering every space of ground that can be cleared of the dead and dying trees. Millions of acres dead, dying trees removed daily and new trees planted daily should be a priority within the USFS written new NWFP. It is important again to remind the USFS it is the younger trees that are growing quickly in fertile soil that are better at this than older trees. Fertile lands are not those that have been burnt deep into the soil. Soils that have been harvested recently will outgrow burnt soil considerably.

It needs to be written within the amendment that all the land to be put back into production as quickly as possible. The dead and dying removed and replanted within a set date for instance 3-4 months after its death. If the value is high many will come and gather the dead up and take them out of the forest for many reasons. Going through how the USFS is currently running the process it takes 2.5 to 5 years and there is little value left within the dead and dying trees, roadbeds have been eroded, natural drainage

overflowing ripping apart the landscape, creeks, rivers, reservoirs chocked full of derbies and sediment washed from burnt barren lands, etc. and all of this could have been prevented. The USFS must make a policy that areas after a fire are treated immediately, and environmentalists have no right to stop you from doing proper management. It just has to stop and the USFS is in charge of protecting lands and rivers within the forest service district boundaries. There is absolutely no need for a NEPA to repair scorched earth where most plants and animals are dead. It is just not right and it needs to stop.

It is unacceptable that the USFS is just going to commandeer lands left unburned, un-diseased, and un-insect riddled for the NSO. These existing lands that are currently living will be renamed mature and old growth forest and habitat for the NSO is not acceptable. A young growing forest is what will keep the NOS alive and prolific. There is plenty of existing old growth stands 200 years and older today for the existing NSO. This is yet another attempt by environmentalists to close even more lands for humans to use. It must be an understanding the invasive species must be controlled, and it is not more land that will save the NSO. It must be written within the amendment that the invasive species must be stopped from living in NSO habitat. It is absolutely arrogant to believe more land will save the NSO without giving the non-native and invasive species Barred Owl more land to populate as well. That is just plain silly, and the bottom line is the NSO will become extinct if this action is continued as stated in the amendment. Please use the current lands and stop from closing more lands to the American public.

This amendment as written will not save the NSO from extinction. This amendment as written has only one purpose and that is to close more land from commerce to rural communities and their fellow Americans.

This amendment has a purpose and that is to stop humans from managing the forest except participating in watching it burn down, watching it continue to turn brown from plant killing diseases and insects. Stopping all forest service management for a growing forest that could produce lumber being milled within the United States. Stopping or slowing the destruction of trees being butchered in other countries will continue if the 1994 NWFP is replaced with the 2025 NWFP. It could be rewritten to include all citizens actively saving the dying forest.

The new forest plan should be about all forest users being on the advisory committee. One or two per group of forest users representing their cause. Example would be two environmentalists, two from and for logging dead dying and living, two for rebuilding the road systems, two for OHVs access and expansion, two from fire fighters making sure access to fires, two for making sure chipping was done and used, ETC. The advisory committee cannot be only anti-access environmentalist against all using the forest for working the forest or all forms of outdoor recreation. Our use is just as important as their nonuse by humans within the forest. However they are they are the current committee, and this is wrong. Why are we not at the table in equal numbers?

This amendment does not account for the population and growth of forest users. Nowhere is a single mentioned how and why the importance of more timber coming out of the forest the mills. Nowhere is mentioned how more land is needed for the expansion of OHV lands and access. The population has grown and forest access for all must grow as well, and it must be included in the 2025 NWFP. Where will the additional OHVs lands be at and who will build new trails, and ways for them. Opening up all closed Level I roads would satisfy many as new trails. Changing the rule that roads, way, routes and trails must be miles apart could change that. Afterall I cannot see a vehicle eighth of a mile away within a true managed forest. It is just not possible and these bad rules need to be changed in any new NWFP.

This amendment will not allow the USFS to participate in actually helping the world in its fight to control global warming. If this statement was not true, this amendment would be filled with pages about how many millions of new trees would be planted. Written with these pages would be how quickly the forest service would be engaged tomorrow morning in clearing the dead and dying and replanting with brand new carbon eaters. It could be rewritten how the USFS could do its job.

This amendment does not include all the current forest user at the table working to make a real NWFP that represents all the American citizens. We had no voice prior and most likely our comments and voice will still not be heard in the NWFP that needs written. Our voice and comments prior to the 1994 NWFP nor our voice and comments prior to this 2024 NWFP have been included. We should have been involved with this plan months ago before it was ever printed. We have been screaming for change for over 30 years for the USFS to save our forest from the delusional environmentalist. We still wait for someone within the USFS to stop this in the rewriting of this amendment. Save the forest and allow all users and workers to continue accessing our public lands.

This amendment has a sole purpose and that primarily is to give the anti-access environmentalist more power to dictate to the USFS how it will not manage public lands. The results will be fewer and fewer humans working or recreating within our national forest in the Northwest.

This amendment does not include proof that the NSO has been burnt out of it habitat within the forest. It does not show that the NSO no longer lives in dead and dying trees. It fails to print that if ever dead and dying tree in time would have turned 200 years old and been new homes to the NSO if not killed directly by results of poor management. This amendment does not spell out due to poor management directly brought on through lawsuit and threat of lawsuits that now the NSO is down possible by over 800000 acres of habitat. This is the result of the USFS allowing themselves to be forced into not managing the forest properly. This needs spelled out exactly why the NSO has lost considerable habitat and it is not from global warming.

The real sad part is the members of the anti-access environmental group has spent years in the writing this amendment making it extremely difficult for all to access the entire forest, creating jobs within the forest, recreating in the outdoors, using motorized

vehicles for work or play in the entire guise that they are not. Making it clear through a committee and deciding for the USFS this will be the way or else. A committee of liked minded individuals is forcing the USFS to write an amendment for us the actual forest users. Without us having the same time or even a place at the table to repute their many false statements. It took years for them to come up with this plan, we need the same time to prove them wrong. How many months have the USFS writers of this amendment been working to write their words? Paying forest personnel as they worked week after week to write their self-imposed words throughout this document without prior input by us for years as well. We have no paid employees. Instead we struggle to find time between work, doctors, disabilities, family times, ETC. to do our best to respond to this amendment that should never have been written. Where are the years and months for us to do the research and find the exacts words needed to comment. Instead of years and months how many days is the USFS giving us to respond? Not all in a room or at a table but spread throughout three states. This is wrong and most likely is not legal to not allow us proper time.

The real plan should be to remove the 1994 NWFP February 2, 2024, and let it no longer be in effect. Making a real committee that includes ***only two from each group*** to be at the table. Controlling the Barred Owl population to minimize their impact on the NSO. Then perhaps in 2.5-5 years make a new NWFP that is agreed upon by all committee members. Putting the USFS back in charge of repairing the forest that cannot be stopped by environmentalists. Using the recommendation of a unified committees' words being the words written and the NWFP built around the people not a single group. Writing up minutes of each meeting and posting online for all to read thus allowing all Americans to be involve. Is there one who is brave within the USFS to start real change in the Pacific Northwest Forest in Region 6 and norther part of Region 5? It is possible the forest that live within those areas could be brought back into a healthy, growing, carbon eating forest covering millions of acres within the next 30 years.

Thank you for allowing us this minimal time to comment on this massive NWFP document plan. We are greatly saddened by not having our involvement prior to the writing of this document. The forest health is in your hands, it will either be healthy and growing or dead and dying as it currently is. We await your decision.

Yours sincerely,

Randy Drake, Oregon State Director of the Pacific Northwest 4-Wheeldrive Association, Chairperson of the Deschutes County 4-Wheelers Trail Task Committee

Randell C. Drake

Mona Drake, Region 6 Director of the Pacific Northwest 4-Wheeldirve Association, member of the Deschutes County 4-Wheelers and treasurer.

Mona L Drake

CERTIFIED MAIL

7019 0700 0002 2007 3402

Retail

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LG ENV
BEND, OR 97701
JAN 29, 2024

$10.10

RDC 99

R2304M115220-8

RECEIVED
JAN 31 2024
By

Randell Drake Oregon Executive Director
Mona Drake Region 6 Director
Pacific Northwest 4 Wheel Drive Assoc
19210 Pinehurst Rd
Bend OR 97703

Regional Forester Region 6 US Forest Service
Attn: Northwest Forest Plan Comments
1220 SW 3rd Ave
Portland OR 97204