

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/20/2024 4:00:00 AM

First name: Phyllis

Last name: Thompson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVES IN THE "DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR "LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN DIRECTION FOR OLD GROWTH FOREST CONDITIONS ACROSS THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM #65356"

What lies behind this Direction to Protect Old Growth Forests is a clear understanding by scientists that complex, mature forests which house many species are the ONLY SYSTEM KNOWN TO REMOVE USEFUL AMOUNTS OF CARBON FROM THE ATMOSPHERE, thereby protecting the whole planet and all the people on it. Historically, management of forests in Oregon where I live has been used to make money. Existing federal policies have also used this strategy -- essentially requiring the cutting of trees to fund the protection of trees.

TREES ARE NOT MONEY ANYMORE. THEY ARE OUR PROTECTORS. We need to create new laws and systems which value them in place. Therefore, my responses to this DEIS are:

? Alternative 1 is the required "no action" alternative.

UNLIKELY TO BE ADOPTED?

Problems that exist arise from lack of effective management funding in the past.

Both "No action" and other current proposals seem to continue seeing "cutting trees" as the only solution to any problem.

? Alternative 2 is the agency's preferred alternative and is based on a theory of "proactive stewardship" for old-growth forests. The stewardship concept retains wide discretion to cut and sell old-growth trees.

ONLY ACCEPTABLE IF ALL OLD GROWTH AND MATURE FOREST STANDS ARE EXCLUDED FROM CUTTING. (See Alternative 3 for my objections to the way Oregon handles tree-cutting strategies which hide behind the "proactive stewardship" veil.)

* Trees sequester carbon when they are left where they are.

* Current "stewardship" practices are more destructive to healthy forests and a healthy planet than anything agencies are doing to "protect" them.

? Alternative 3 restricts commercial logging in old growth forests, but still allows the felling of old-growth trees.

COMMERCIAL LOGGING IS NOT ACCEPTABLE BECAUSE IT INCREASES CARBON EMISSIONS, DAMAGES HABITAT, and REDUCES JOBS.

* Logging machines and log trucks are gas guzzlers = they add to the atmosphere's carbon. Logging machines also reduce the number of jobs available to loggers.

* Slash burning adds carbon to the air.

* Commercial logging in Oregon relies on aerial sprays that poison water, harming humans and salmon, etc.

* Commercial tree farms use poisons that kill beavers and the birds who eat their carcasses.

* Commercial logging that ships logs overseas for milling uses a huge amount of gas and deprives local mills and workers of jobs.

FELLING OLD-GROWTH TREES AND REMOVING THEM FROM THE FOREST IS UNACCEPTABLE.

Even naturally-fallen trees sequester carbon and slowly release nutrients to the forest ecosystem.

THIS IS TRUE OF ANY COMPLEX, MATURE FOREST SYSTEM.

? Alternative 4 permits timber production and commercial logging in old growth forests without requiring ecological or restoration purposes.

UNACCEPTABLE