

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/22/2025 5:08:33 PM

First name: Brandt

Last name: Mannchen

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear U.S. Forest Service (FS),

These are my personal comments about the Northwest Forest Plan Amendment #64745 and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

1. I support Alternative A, the so-called No Action Alternative. This alternative has been misnamed and characterized as the, "No Action Alternative". The 3 other alternatives, B, C, and D, have been called "action alternatives". However, Alternative A provides action and has done so and been implemented for 30 years. Alternative A proposes to continue that good action into the future. Therefore, Alternative A is an "action alternative, and shouldn't be mislabeled as not being one.

2. I don't support Alternatives B, C, and D because they allow annual timber harvests to rise by at least 33% and may actually allow a rise in annual timber harvest of 200%. I don't support taxpayer subsidized wildfire mitigation logging to subsidize timber and other jobs.

We are logging and creating more climate change air pollution in the name of ecosystem restoration. The FS does this to allow timber companies to make money in ways that are greedy, hurt the American public, and hurt our public lands legacy. That dog won't hunt!

3. The three other alternatives, B, C, and D, don't give the forest and other ecosystems time to adjust to climate change and then begin to change to their appropriate successional form. The FS wants to log to what it thinks the ecosystems should be today or some future scenario. The FS has no idea if that future scenario is accurate or will occur.

Climate change is still occurring and will continue to do so until we stop putting too much climate change air pollution (CO₂, CH₄, and other pollutants) into the air. We must allow the delayed effects of too much climate change air pollution to show itself. We can never guess what management should be and what harm we do to ecosystems when we don't allow natural carbon storage of existing living vegetation and vegetation that naturally or is human planted to grow to its potential via old age.

4. I'm against allowing trees older than 80 years to be logged by this proposal. The FS proposes to allow logging of trees at least 150 years old or younger and in some cases trees older than this.

The best trees to store climate change air pollution (carbon) are mature, older, and old growth trees. Young trees may store carbon at a higher rate, but they don't store more carbon due to their small size. I want all mature, older, and old growth trees, at least as many as possible, to live and continue to store carbon until they biologically die.

Even old trees that die store carbon well. This is because they take a long time to totally decay and thus release carbon at a slower rate that over years. I know, by looking at trees killed by southern pine beetles in Sam Houston National Forest, that in such high decay environments as the South you can still identify trees that were cut and left over 30 years ago. The same, but even longer decay rotations, occur in the Pacific Northwest.

We need these longer decay rotations and we need to allow trees to grow until they die. This is because now is when we need to slow down climate change effects before we reach a "tipping point". If we reach a "tipping point" it will be too late and no matter what we do will matter in stopping global warming of the planet and the

effects this has on all living things as well as people. I don't want any living thing, including people, to become extinct because of human stupidity because we didn't stop human created climate change.

5. We are like a dog chasing its tail and we will never get our management right if we don't first reduce climate change air pollution to a more normal level. More logging isn't the answer no matter what foresters in the FS say. Logging proponents in the FS have advocated more logging for more than 100 years and this logging hasn't solved the problems we have in our National Forests. The public understands that the FS is a logging agency and not an ecosystem restoration agency, no matter what the FS says or advocates as its changed mission.

Nature did fine before humans came and will do fine again as long as we stop our pollution and manipulation of ecological successional processes and protect water, soil, vegetation, and animal life. Let Nature be Nature. Control humans, not Nature.

6. No matter what the FS says, trees aren't older when they are 80 years old. Since in the Pacific Northwest many trees that are commercially valuable grow to 400-500 years, 80-year-old trees are only 16-20% their maximum age. In a human analogy, this means taking 16-20-year-olds and saying they are older when they are juveniles or adolescents. In other words, we need to walk our walk and not just talk our talk. We need to apply our standards for others to ourselves. Arrogance has no place in protection and proper management of forests.

I support Alternative A and don't support logging of mature, older, mature late succession, late succession, and old growth trees. These old and growing older trees are the way for forests to help us stop our suicidal climate change air pollution nightmare. Will we finally be that smart that we learn from our mistakes? I can only hope so for all living things sake.

Brandt Mannchen