

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/14/2020 6:42:39 AM

First name: Heidi

Last name: Adolphsen

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The 21 inch rule needs to be retained as a rule, rather than a guideline. The claims that the current forest service is making that the 21 inch rule would be better if it were more flexible, so that they could better prevent forest fires and insect infestations may have some marginal truth, however the benefits of keeping the rule the way it is, outweigh the cost of the rigidity of the rule. The first reason that I believe that the 21 inch rule should not be changed is that despite our common love for the forest service, and the hard work of those doing research and protection of our forests, the American people do not trust congress, as well as the presidency, to not use this effective repeal as an excuse to give into pressures from large timber companies. There is a continual risk, that if we do not maintain a hardline protection of old growth trees, which are crucial to our ecosystems, that any higher up government will make exceptions for deforestation and decimation of E. Oregon forests. The second reason that the 21 inch rule ought to be maintained as a rule, is that despite some need for flexibility of this rule, the large majority of large trees would be better left untouched. Concerns about forest fires and insects are rooted in the idea that these things are inherently bad, or unnatural, whereas, we need to allow forests more room to grow ecologically, rather than constrict the current natural process.