

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/15/2022 8:28:11 PM

First name: Samuel

Last name: Ainsley

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The executive order is more top-down management of our national forests, and likely a land grab to cut off more areas from forest management activities. This order will likely accomplish nothing other than make another hoop to jump through or offer more space for scrutiny of basic forest management. The days of clearcutting all the old growth has long come and gone; forestry has changed. For decades, forests have been defining and managing "old growth" in their respective units and regions. Each unit has a forest plan which most likely severely limits activities in old growth anyway. This order may provide benefit if it leads to a clear definition of what old growth really is, because it can be subjective and different depending by individual and locality. With it clearly defined and identified, will we manage old growth with a "hands off" approach? This hand off approach has likely contributed to losses of old growth in recent years by not allowing for fuels reduction or thinning, which would help prevent a stand replacement wildfire. Old growth usually needs tending to as well to preserve it. If this Order is more red tape or a land grab thing it will have negative impacts on the old growth that is left. My recommendation is to define it only and let each unit decide how to incorporate old growth or mature patches into their forest plans. If this is really about having more big trees out on the landscape, then we need more precommercial and commercial thinning/fuels reduction while allowing for x-amount trees/acre of legacy trees to exist for the long-run. I'd rather let the local communities and local land managers who know their forests better than anyone else figure out what works for their areas.