

To the US Forest Service,

I am writing as a citizen forest ranger and a volunteer for the Coast Range Association.

Oregon has less than 2% of virgin old growth forest remaining, and all the late reserve mature forest that is being opened up to logging under this amendment, could have the potential to become old growth, if we protect it with a better amendment. I say no to this amendment. Parts of it are good, but the foundation of each 'option' is in error, and goes against the original intent of the NWFP to protect forests from deforestation and wildlife extinctions.

Incorporating native indigenous tribal voices is crucial to the long term sustainability of the environment, but within the amendment this option is paired with opening up late mature forest stands to aggressive logging. Clearcut logging and aggressive thinning has already deforested massive amounts of primary and late mature forest in the northwest. We see it in the valley here, as we look at our hills to the west, the Coast Range, and our hills to the east, the Cascades. Where can anyone look and not see the scarring, across the entire mountain ranges? I say NO to clear cut or aggressive thinning of any mature forest, any forest over 80 years old. All of these mature forests should remain protected on federal lands as the NWFP intended to do. Otherwise, our public lands will become an industrial forest, and in real time, that means, the destruction of forests and the extinction of native species.

Show me real restorative practices, and actual sustainable timber harvesting. I say no to all the euphemisms that mean, in practice, deforestation; including: roadside hazard abatement, fire suppression management, restorative harvesting, etc.

I want to stand in the regal forests, to smell the crisp sweetness in the air, the deep oxygen that the forest breathes, see the clear water, and hear the bird calls. they said #IDLENOMORE, yes, and can we go further? I say #CLEARCUTNOMORE. we are smarter than that. we can harvest timber in sustainable ways without resorting to spraying poison herbicides, and clear cut felling, aggressive thinning, and planting monoculture death tree farms.

If we conserve mature forest now we can restore our forest to the Old Growth majesty, the ecologically intact functional forests, that Oregon was before the great devastation of colonialism. If we protect the late mature forest we can begin to connect together these ecosystems for all of Oregon's imperiled wildlife. We need MORE protections now, not less. We need Wildlife corridors to connect all the remaining public lands. Without wildlife connectivity and better protections for late mature forest habitats, biodiversity will continue to fail and cascade towards more extinctions.

And, the elephant in the room, the communities around these natural places will decline, and eventually fall into ruin, just as they have, at every single other place on the planet where profit has been put above good stewardship.

I am not a scientist, only an ordinary working person living in Oregon with a family and a very modest income. I have become a citizen ranger in the National Forest in my region with the help of the conservation groups here in Oregon. I have seen firsthand all of these types of national forests in the public trust. I don't believe one needs to know the 'science' to see and understand what is wise and what is unwise. I have seen the killer fungus that is affecting nearly all the plantation trees in some areas that were planted in monocultures after clearcuts. I have seen the resiliency and diversity, and absolute beauty, and health, and vitality of the mature forests that have reached 80 years and older. The difference is striking and obvious.

For specific points referring to the amendment I reference the Coast Range Association Official Comment to the NWFP Amendment,

The first 10 points they make have to do with wildfire and the climate crisis. pretty basic for anyone with any forethought. I agree on all the points.

11. Forest thinning must maintain at least 70% canopy cover after thinning.

--I'm reading this as NO to aggressive thinning-ecologically unsound and another form of deforestation!---

12. Commercial forest thinning must be replaced by Forest Service budget funded thinning.

--Same as above, do the people want dead and dying forests or do they want real complex forests managed wisely?--no brainer

13. Supportive infrastructure for SNF dispersed recreational activities must be part of the DEIS.

---It is interesting how this is totally absent from the document. I would say that folks at the Coast Range want people visiting these places, these are public lands after all, the more people see the forest, the more they will understand and want to protect it---I AGREE

The Coast Range Association will submit separate DEIS comments addressing “Providing a predictable supply of timber and non-timber products and other economic opportunities to support the long-term sustainability of communities located proximate to National Forest System lands and economically connected to forest resources.”

-This is touted within the amendment to justify opening up stands of trees between 80 and 120 years old, a clear violation of the original intent of the NWFP. I personally don't need to look too deep to read what this actually means is more profit for the federal reserve (NOT the States) and especially huge profit to big timber companies. As far as local communities, sure, more jobs, vulnerable jobs, dependent on the will of the big corporations, those that hand out median pay at huge risk. At the end of the day, more intensive

logging of mature forests will leave the local communities bereft of their natural resources and at clear risk for more fire, more heat, more drought, more air pollution, more water pollution, and continued catastrophic decline of biodiversity. Everywhere in the world where this sort of 'management' style is enacted has led to collapse and eventually the deforested areas simply turn into wasteland, as the land under industrial timber management, has already become in Oregon--

There are already millions of acres of plantations of trees younger than 80 year old in Oregon, both federal, state, and private 'forest' lands which can all be exploited for economic gain, as such, there need be no opposition to manage for profit those lands, which are mostly unhealthy and acutely in need of better management.

14. We incorporate by reference all tribal related recommendations contained in the Federal Advisory Committee's Report at: fseprd1181977.pdf

--The Most important thing for our future is going to be allowing the tribes and indigenous leaders with ecological knowledge with heritage **from each specific ecoregion**. to start giving input and being involved equally in making decisions about each of these areas---m.v.

15. We applaud the Forest Service for maintaining Late Successional Reserve areas. However, we strenuously oppose future commercial timber harvest as a management practice in LSRs. The harvest of naturally regenerated stands in LSRs within the Siuslaw National Forest, no matter what age, will engender vigorous public opposition. Option B's proposal to harvest stands in LSRs up to 119 years of age is a dead-in-the-water idea and wrong forest management.

--WRONG FOREST MANAGEMENT--Exactly. LSRs Need MORE Protection at this time of Climate and Biodiversity Collapse, Not Less! 80 years and older. these forest stands are the future, they are the vanguard of what could be our salvation as a species on this earth.

Let us stand together for our Earth, and not get pitted against each other by the corporate parasites being proxied as 'improvement' and 'success'. True success lies in our eyes, ears, minds, hearts, and spirits, looking and seeing the forest, not for the trees, but for the life it gives.

I will end with this: Why do people want to live in, and visit Oregon? It's Green, It has vast natural beauty, It has clean water, rich earth, and fresh 'tree' mountain air, It has wonders of the forests, the ocean, and all it's wildlife and wildlands still intact, ONLY JUST. The remaining intact land is still here because of activists like CRA and Oregon Wild, historically, many, many more. ANY time a place or habitat in Oregon, or anywhere, was protected was because an environmental activist person or group of people took the time to stand up, speak out, and work with other interest groups to defy Industrial Government Complex Corporations. All of this historical work, like the Northwest Forest Plan, was done to the betterment of the whole, the whole community, the state, the federal interest, the international and national

tourist sector, the whole ecological system of integrity, diversity, and richness.

-Madeline Vance