Forest Plan 2016

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on your 15-year forest plan.

It is refreshing to see that the Forest Service provides opportunities to coordinate with the counties holding parcels of the Colville National Forest within their boundaries. Also that the Forest Service will strike an appropriate balance between ecological protection and local, state and federal economic needs.

It is somewhat confusing as to why there are so many alternative plans. Makes one wonder whose agenda the plan is being designed for.

Question:

There are numerous references to ‘climate change’ and it is difficult to understand if you are concerned about warming or cooling. This may be on purpose as the scientists are at odds on global warming or cooling and what role humans play in climate change.

Here is the question; **Why is there not a plan to manage the forest to assist in the capture of carbon?**

In the sixth grade some 50 plus years ago my science teacher had us study the importance of carbon capture by maturing trees and how mature trees held carbon. If the forest were to be managed in regards to reducing man’s carbon footprint, why are we not cutting mature trees and using these to improve human shelter etc... thus holding carbon (wood is replacing concrete, this also reduces the carbon footprint cause by use of concrete), and plant new trees to replace these mature trees so the new maturing trees will take up carbon for growth and thus reduce the carbon in the air? When mature and old growth forest are burned (by nature or man) there is significant tonnage of carbon released into the environment adding to the “global warming” some theorist fear.

Thank you,
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