

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

First name: Janel

Last name: Clarke

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am concerned about the policy around Forest Management and it is clear to me that there is a lack of understanding about how the trees contribute to communities and to ecosystems, and to life itself. These are things that cannot be easily put into an economic framework that does them justice, yet this is the task before those who are responsible for preserving and protecting our Nation's resources.

The beauty alone of magnificent old growth trees cannot be put into an economic frame, yet they are indeed valuable; not as a resource to be used but as a key species that supports other life forms of which humans may not completely understand yet.

What also strikes me as essential to recognize, is that every community facing the imminent destruction of their landscape - know this is being done by their own federal government. I am stunned that the government proposes to use tax-paid money to destroy virgin forest lands that are older than anyone alive can remember. It is a clear scientific fact that this proposed destruction would ultimately ruin the communities through landslides and silted streams alone. So, what on Earth makes the economic value of something more important than the quality of life itself that cannot be replace or regrown for another 200 plus years into the future.

Certainly, the value system of beauty is actually sustainable, yet corporations may not ever be able to come to that position. The bullshit notion that markets will ever actually allow beauty to have equal value to money is laughable, and thus why I roll my eyes when some corporate "social responsibility" officer drones on about how they value [whatever] when even they know it's not true.

I am speaking up because it is clear that this is one of the most all encompassing nature-related policies ever implemented, and it could destroy forever one of our primary sources of beauty - trees well over 200 years old. Also, these trees are an important factor in regulating temperatures, filtering drinking water, and protecting wildlife, among many other gifts they give. Two hundred years is a long time to wait to bring them back, and in fact, that is not part of the plan. Instead, different species of trees, ones that grow faster, but thinner, and which will be cut again, are planted in their place, if planting is done at all.

This is a bizarre disregard for life, and I know that by law, the Forest Service must read every comment. There are two value systems here in this topic. One is beauty and the other is money. They do not have to be mutually exclusive. In all reality, when it comes down to who is implementing these value systems, that is what determines whether the two can be merged successfully.

For example, the Menomonie of Northeastern Wisconsin also log commercially, but they do it in a respectful,

sustaining way. They even harvest trees that are over 200 years old, but they respect these trees, and so their logging is done - how shall I say it - prayerfully? It is done with reverence. The result is industry-wide acknowledgement that theirs is the best timber on the market.

They have actually combined the two value systems as a way to honor future generations and the land itself and all life upon that land. They have demonstrated that there is a better way to commercially log. I do not blame the individuals in the Forest Service, but I do question why their plans can't take the sustaining power of beauty into account. It is time for different policies. Please reconsider these policies... at least give any action more time, because acts of destruction cannot be undone.