

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/19/2024 4:00:00 AM

First name: Steve

Last name: Knox

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Comments to the [ldquo]Amendments to Land Management Plans to Address Old-Growth Forests Across the National Forest System[rdquo] Draft EIS

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft EIS.

#### General Comment

People have been utilizing forest products in what is now the United States for hundreds of years, and indigenous communities much longer than that. There are literally thousands (probably millions [ndash] I don[rsquo]t have the numbers) of acres being managed for the production of lumber and other products nationwide on private, state, public, and tribal lands. On page 14 of the Summary of the draft EIS you state [ldquo]As of 2019, only 3 percent of national timber consumption originated from National Forest lands[rdquo]; [ldquo][hellip] the old-growth amendment is unlikely to have major effects on timber supplied from the National Forest System [hellip][rdquo]; and [ldquo][hellip] no effects are expected on traditional industry jobs in logging [hellip][rdquo]. So, it begs the question, why don[rsquo]t we manage our remaining old growth for its protection and preservation? For the other incredible resource values and uses old-growth provides, instead of lumber?

#### Specific Comment

On page 6 of Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, it states that the [ldquo][hellip] responsible official shall [hellip] determine:

\* Whether and how to amend National Forest System land management plans

When will the public learn which Forest plans will be amended and when, so that we can understand the details of how old-growth is proposed to be managed forest by forest? The alternatives presented in this draft EIS present the goals, management approaches, desired conditions, objectives, standards, etc. that will guide that process, but how exactly will those tools be used by the Forest Service to determine exactly how and where old-growth will be managed forest by forest?

So, giving consideration to my comments above, I do support the Modified Proposed Action Alternative because I believe that proactive stewardship of old-growth is needed for management of other resource/use needs, including wildlife management; fire, insect, and disease management; traditional cultural practices; and limited developments such as trails [ndash] if conducted in a limited and careful manner.

Thank you!

ATTACHMENT: FS OG plan amendment comments.docx - this is the same content that is coded in text box; it was originally only included as an attachment