

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/18/2023 3:30:27 PM

First name: M

Last name: C

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Will LSRs still be incorporated? LSR's did not seem very successful for NSO conservation. In the past limits on management options to reduce fire danger made LSRs largely unsustainable in certain ecosystems. Given that on Forest Service land, the leading cause of habitat loss is wildfire, this seems important to address. I also question the value of LSR areas since it creates habitat for barred owls which are another major cause of decline for the NSO. The email did not include any mention of ESA and other species protections beside a vague phrase "related biodiversity". It seems like the phrase was intentionally vague enough for the reader to infer what they want that to mean instead of stating any actual intentions on the part of the agency.

Will the revised plan create or streamline programmatic agreements for fuel treatments to ensure forests are able to do the bare minimum management activities for a sustainable forest with the resources and timbe constraint upon them.

Will the plan address management issues for known and studies landscape events of die off, such as the Douglas-fir die off occurring across southern Oregon. Many stands have attributes that make analysis for removing considerable portions of the canopy lengthy and costly, but studies by OSU show that under certain circumstances a majority of the Douglas-fir is expected to die regardless. A large scale die off will create future management issues in fuels, fire management, and safety. Treating dead and decaying snags, because of bureaucratic red tape prevented early intervention, will be more costly, time consuming, and put personnel in unnecessary risk of fallen trees. Ideally clearcut and efficient protocols to treat similar situations would save the agency time and money, especially if a timely intervention would allow for removal of dying trees while still merchantable. A reasonable compromise would enable timely intervention in areas of most concern for human safety and resource concerns (infrastructure, and recreational sites).

Will the plan address the disparity between timber and other resources. The original NWFP was in intended to ensure timber while also protecting other resources, but timber quantities still plummeted, and mills closed down. The Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 mandates the Forest Service provide a sustained yield of timber that is balanced with other resources. How will the plan address that many forests timber levels seem to fluctuate considerably from year to year. Fluctuations in timber supply create supply line challenges for mills. Ensuring mills have a stable flow of timber forces industrial timber lands to harvest more heavily. This connected or "downstream" effect of forests' inconsistency in timber supply is never included in analysis of projects. How will this be addressed in the new plan. The message sent out didn't even mention timber as an interest in any way. Will the correction be to make the Forest Service's interest in timber official or will it attempt to realign to the intent of the original document and federal mandates stating timber is one of the agency's obligations? Currently timber is often an afterthought or side product of other actions, such as habitat restoration. When timber is allowed limitations and oversight by other resources can be stifling.