

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/19/2024 4:00:00 AM

First name: Richard

Last name: Whitmore

Organization:

Title:

Comments: It is my opinion after trying to read the exhaustive but uninformative information you provided that this plan is a worst failure than the north west forest plan.

This plan is so cumbersome and incomplete that it will cause more harm to the environment and economic stability of forest communities.

Your plan is incomplete (no economic feasibility).

In the Pacific North West you have destroyed the timber industry and communities that helped you in the past. Now that they hardly exist there is no way they can help you with this plan. Your assumption that timber dollars will help pay for this plan is erroneous in most areas because of the lack of harvesters and mills . You would have to pay them to do your work instead.

Since the U.S. forest service changed its philosophy from a land based decision maker to a Top down over regulated agency We have been losing almost all if not all resources through neglect.

Since your agency started pandering to the environmentalists we have been losing our national forests to fire insects and disease, turning a blind eye to the agencies part in this.

By making more half baked rules and regulations is not going to solve the problem but make it worse. The NWFP is a perfect example of this.

Active forest management as we had in the past is the only way out of the mess you, environmentalists, and politicians have created.

Your unrealistic planning with poor, nontransparent decisions is pathetic. As I read your plan I could see that science, social-economic, and current conditions were misrepresented and should be realistically reworked by someone with out so much biased.

This plan is a perfect sign that the forest service has lost its focus of multiple use and forest community support. Why is old-growth more important than the other resources? If you had not changed from active forest and fire management we would not be having to make comments to this unworkable plan, and the future of old-growth will not change but will keep on being destroyed by mismanagement.

Scrap this plan and go back to on the ground active forest management to save our old-growth.

The forest service is broken and needs to admit it and change.

It is time to stop listening to the people who got you into this mess and maybe talk to professionals in the field of forest management that are not just so myopic that they can't see the forest through the trees. The work is done on the ground not in the office. One plan of this magnitude does not do justice to all the different circumstances on the ground.

Scrap the plan and start over, the right way, Multiple use.