

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/17/2024 8:28:40 PM

First name: Tim

Last name: Seaman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As shown in the documents, the threats to old-growth forests are primarily natural disturbance. I do not think this has adequately been recognized in the USFS' communications and public discourse. In the decision, and in related communications and messaging, and in working with partners, the USFS should strongly emphasize this point. You must better tell the story of how active management protects and enhanced old-growth characteristics.

I feel that documents and discourse overemphasizes the impact of logging on reducing old growth, when prescribed fire easily and often causes greater losses of old-growth. Fire is a blunt tool that can cause unpredictable outcomes, while logging is usually much more precise. Prescribed fire is like doing surgery with a hammer, while logging is like using a scalpel. The alternative that most restricts activity in old growth allows prescribed fire, which doesn't make sense to me. I feel that that alternative greatly handicaps land managers without meeting the intent of the EO.

Simplicity, flexibility, and options for land managers should be key in this decision. Land managers should be trusted to implement the intent of the EO.

Additionally, with limited budgets, the additional workloads for district staff, such as stand exams, must be funded and acknowledged. I appreciate that the focus is on old growth, rather than mature, as this keeps things simple.