

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/25/2022 8:39:38 PM

First name: Beth

Last name: Sirr

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for accepting public comment.

I imagine you have directives that are in conflict with what the greater body of science supports as best for the health and well being of ecosystems, wildlife, and the long term interests of the public.

I say this because what is happening with our natural resources seems so disconnected from the data available from scientists. The facts that should matter to your "treatment" proposal:

1. The U.S. has less than 4% of wilderness left in the lower 48. With 96% gone, shouldn't rationale humans be working to preserve all natural places and substituting alternatives for tree products?

2. Dr. Whitlock's research and a vast body of other science has found unlogged forests help offset wild fire risk and more trees are needed to offset atmospheric CO2 and Earth's trajectory to exceed 3 degrees of warming and climate catastrophe. Why are taxpayers subsidizing such destructive "treatments" that endanger so many vital public interests ?

3. Because of higher temps, shrinking snowpacks, and more humans in MT, wild places once destroyed are less likely to ever come back. It is time we see our species' behaviors honestly-we have impacted the Earth by consuming more than is sustainable and we need to change our behavior or perish. In this case the choice is to protect publicly owned natural wildlife spaces, or to destroy them with "treatments".

You get to decide, and my hope is that protecting our beautiful natural forests will be worth more to you than supplying the appetites of the logging industry.

Thank you,

Beth Sirr