

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/27/2024 1:13:00 AM

First name: Nicole

Last name: Martel

Organization:

Title:

Comments: With all due respect, I am utterly shocked and dismayed by this project. It is extreme, dangerous, and very irresponsible on so many levels. The level of human interference, destruction, and manipulation borders on insanity. How can a project like this be justified? Unbiased Science and evidence is showing that logging, thinning, and prescribed fires create even more dry conditions, including allowing for invasive species to grow in place of natives, which creates even more flammable conditions and destroys ecosystems. We should be protecting our remaining forests due to their Ecosystem Services and important contributions to climate change, etc.. Not to mention how much they support and regulate our weather patterns. There is strong ecological and scientific evidence to protect trees, especially those over 80 years old in structurally-diverse forests. This holds true for wildfire mitigation as well, since our natural, intact ecosystems and forests hold more moisture and density, making them much more resilient to fire than the dry conditions of logged, thinned or plantation areas. Therefore, cutting any mature forest seems extremely irresponsible. From a wilderness perspective, it is far better to allow natural, lightning-caused fire to play its role, rather than to invade Wilderness to cut down "undesirable" trees and burn forests based on human wishes and desires. While I recognize that fire has played, and continues to play, an ecological role in these Wildernesses, the Forest Service proposal represents a huge human-driven manipulation of Wilderness that is inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the 1964 Wilderness Act. In fact, the Forest Service is even proposing to ignite some fires in Wilderness using helicopters and drones! This is too much of a disconnected act, and there is no way that you can see how much damage is being done to the ecosystems from that level. It is my understanding that the Forest Service is here to PROTECT and support healthy forests, not destroy them. We only have a very small percentage left... Why wouldn't we save them? But the misinformation coming out is extreme, and it speaks to the conflict of interest for receiving money for land and timber.

These are the concerns and facts that many people are waking up to....And we are wanting our government organizations to do the same.

But the response is often these sophisticated justifications and excuses that put up a block against any honest discussion or collaboration to find and implement viable alternatives. We know that nature is highly intelligent, and knows how to balance itself out if given the time and space to do so. Human interference in the name of "management" is misguided and ignorant, and most likely money driven with some special interest or agenda involved.

People's priorities are changing and evolving. I am part of a growing collective of people who are realizing what is happening, and how important our forests and trees are alive, not as a crop or resource for commercial purposes.

If it must continue, I support Alternative C, the Wilderness Exclusion Alternative. The Forest Service should exclude all designated and recommended Wildernesses from its proposed cutting and burning plans for the Sequoia and Sierra National Forests in order to comply with the Wilderness Act.

The Forest Service should also add the Moses Mountain Recommended Wilderness to Alternative C.

However, I feel this whole plan is a serious mistake, and should be canceled. The agency should instead allow natural, lightning-caused fire to play its ecological role in designated and recommended Wilderness on the Sequoia and Sierra National Forests.

With everything that I am, I sincerely ask that you realize the irreversible damage and impact this project will have. We can't go back after an operation like this, and it could redirect the course of the balance and health of the entire planet. There is nothing that should justify such a destructive plan. There are other solutions, and it's a matter of respecting the very nature that sustains life. That is true stewardship. Please, please reconsider.

THANK YOU ~