

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/1/2024 4:30:48 PM

First name: Karl

Last name: Kaufmann

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As someone who actually LIVES in the area affected by this proposal, I strongly object. This area is in need of just the opposite. I have a degree in biology and worked in forestry education for three decades. This area's greatest need is to reduce the very real threat of catastrophic wildfire and improve severely degraded moose and lynx habitat IS timber harvesting. Timber harvests replacing dead nonproductive balsam and red pine past its rotation age regenerate with young trees that actually cool the forest floor, take in more carbon dioxide and give off more oxygen due to faster growth rates than trees slowed at the end of their life span. Timber products then represent not only a renewable resource, but themselves long term storage of carbon. Much more so than standing old growth timber represents. As appealing as "old growth" sounds, the facts are, young forests support significantly more wildlife both in terms of diversity and population per acre. This is an indisputable fact borne in forest/wildlife research again and again. Additionally, younger forests are much less susceptible to wind and wildfire events. Three of the most critical wildlife species in the affected area, moose, lynx and wolves, rely on the younger more vigorous stands of timber in the region. This area has historically been a mix of forest types and ages brought on by the regular disturbance of wildfire and other natural disturbances. The modern prevention of these increases the need for silviculture and man made disturbance. This IS a poor plan based upon emotional appeal of "old growth". It is not in the best interest of the area's actual forest vitality, it's predominate and iconic wildlife species, its residents or the local economy.