

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/7/2024 4:22:01 AM

First name: JoAnn

Last name: Marlette

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The Need for Change document does not meet my family's needs, and does not reflect past comments on what needs to be changed in the current management plans. The planning team needs to hold meetings with the public being involved in this process to refine the Need for Change document that truly meets the need for change in our communities. Accordingly, the need for change and assessment failed to specifically address how the 1990 forest plans are inconsistent with the 2012 planning rule. If anything, it looks as though the 2012 planning rule is not consistent with the 1990 plan.

If the current forest plans are inconsistent with the 2012 planning rule, how is it that a revision of the plan is warranted and not a comprehensive new plan being written? Also, why is the agency utilizing a cross-walk of the 2018 effort if the old forest plan revision that was withdrawn was based prior to the 2012 rule? What's up? It looks like the same document is trying to be shoved down the public's throat. Come on everyone, where's our integrity?

Also, the public has not been allowed into the process to create durable, implementable, integrated land management plans. The public has consistently requested, since 2018's withdrawal of the failed attempt to revise the forest plans, to be engaged at the BIC and participate as co-equals in the planning process. The public has been denied access all along while special interest groups have been allowed membership to the detriment of our local residents. It sounds quite disingenuous to read the statement that the Forest Service wants to work together to create durable plans, while the general public is not allowed to participate in this process, only a select few. It's made to appear like "public engagement," but it's not. SHAME!

Does the forest service plan to sustain the current, depressed, economic conditions that have plagued the region for the last nearly forty (40) years, or does the agency plan to develop management plans to improve those conditions through more extractive, working lands models of management? The need "for change language" would be better served as "developed contributions from Forest Service administered lands that promote social and economic vitality, not sustainability." The forest service decision to keep timber out of our mills, crippled our eastern Oregon economies, and it was all based on numerous misrepresentations and untruths, basically lies. When our US citizens are consistently told untruths and misrepresentations made, all credibility is lost. SHAME!

As we are all aware from living day to day, week to week, month to month, and year to year that the climate changes each and every day. First it was defined as "global warming." Then, when we had a few years of very cold weather, it became known as "climate change." In your opinion, please define what is a changing climate?

We all want healthy landscapes and we all want healthy communities. The problem is the idea that, in order to maintain or restore aquatic habitat and eco systems integrity, we must close the forest. In this regard, replace the wording "we must close the forest" with the following wording: "through a well-maintained road infrastructure that allows for managed working land to meet item number 4," (the social and economic item). We cannot have these things, if we cannot maintain them and manage them.

I agree, the public's goal is also to maintain and restore the health of our forests. With the Forest Service working together with our citizens, that is a very attainable goal. It is very important to the citizens to have this statement changed or added to include the wording: "through a well-maintained road infrastructure that allows for managed working land to meet item number 4," (again, the social and economic item).

It's been noted that through all these seven items, there is only one consideration given to the social and

economics of our communities, and everything else is environmentally based, completely neglecting and overlooking our communities.

As we are all well aware, the Forest Service was created to meet the needs of the public, including the public's use of the forest as well as multi-use purposes, which include recreation, timber industry, minerals, water, grazing, fish, wildlife and wilderness. Somehow, the Forest Service lost their way in their mission as now logging is bad and, apparently, people are bad, and whatever else they may deem bad in the future. Please remember that the forests belong to the citizens of the United States of America, not the government. Please have the courtesy to treat them with the respect they deserve. They pay your salaries!