

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/27/2024 6:27:12 PM

First name: Shelby

Last name: Edwards

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear Staff,

I'm writing today in support of Alternative 3 - more restrictive standards for old growth and in opposition of Alternative 2.

Alternative 2 continues to center commercial timber harvest as well as allowing for mining operations, road building, livestock grazing. This continued focus on commercial harvest is directly incompatible with health of old-growth stands. Keeping the focus on the tree, not the ecosystem these big trees represent.

In the text detailing Alternative 2, the Forest Service admits that "nationally the timber industry is unlikely to be impacted...", that Alternative 2 is "unlikely to create a shortfall in national supply of timber but may increase pressure to harvest additional Forest Service areas". Continuing the legacy of placing timber production first vs. preservation of mature and intact old-growth trees in the time of rapid climate change when we have a fraction of old-growth remaining is insufficient. Alternative 2 does not meet the President's goal of preserving old-growth. It simply does not go far enough.

Alternative 3 properly moves to restrict all commercial timber harvest of old-growth. While recognizing the shift this will require for industry, this alternative serves the goal of protecting the last of what remains. Old-growth preservation has a major role to play in carbon reduction, reduction of wild-fire risk, and species preservation. Living here in Washington, I have access to this now rare landscape and the values of preserving it out weigh the commercial profit.

Thank you.