

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/19/2024 7:23:32 PM

First name: Brian

Last name: von Dedenroth

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My wife and I moved to OR from Southern California nearly 10 years ago. We've had our 2 kids here and are very happy we made the move. What attracted us to OR was a smaller population, water in the form of lakes, rivers, and yes even rain, and its abundant forests.

Every time I have flown over the forests of OR, driven south on I-5, or driven to the coast, I am shocked by the scars of clear cuts I see across the landscape. It is a shocking disturbance in the quality of the landscape and undermines healthy ecosystems including the streams and rivers that make up watersheds. The timber industry tries to mask their destructive practices with beauty strips and signage of newly planted monocrops of the same tree planted for harvest production purposes not for healthy forests.

In reading over the new plan the words I see repeatedly are "a predictable commercial timber supply". That seems to be the crux of why this change is being implemented. Where is the science that says forest thinning of old growth trees which support an abundant web of life and keeps the ecosystem intact and wetter would benefit from being thinned? This effort strikes me as an economic ploy by the timber industry in conjunction with the Federal forest service to strip present Oregonians, Californians, and Washingtonians of all species of their ability to not only enjoy intact old growth forests for recreation and habitat, but to put our watersheds and critical habitat for animals that rely on these forests and watersheds at risk. There is much talk of maintaining or improving salmon habitat. How will building roads and mechanical thinning accomplish this? It won't. How eliminating a portion of large trees that keep a damp undergrowth intact help these forests resist rather than encourage more fire? It won't.

Rural economies would be better addressed through ecotourism, internet access, and job training for high paying jobs of the future than an extractive industry that denudes the land that surrounds where they live.

The future federal administration will, as they did in the past, look for every opportunity to increase timber extraction on federal lands. Why make it easier for that to happen by wearing the protections these lands have now which were set in place under an administration that understood the value of protecting these lands.

This is a shortsighted plan that gives an open ticket to the timber industry to get what they have been striving for under the guise of fire safety because of climate change. I urge you to revise this plan and keep old growth forests which should be cataloged and defined by at minimum 80 years and older off the cutting board and address the concerns over the economies of rural communities in ways that look to the future, not the past and address fire danger through education and preparation, not more timber harvesting.