

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/3/2025 8:11:54 PM

First name: Diane

Last name: Meisenhelter

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear NW Forest Service managers, I am writing on behalf of the action committee of XRPDX, a 1500 member climate justice organization in Portland. We are appalled at the proposed alternatives being put forward for the revised NW Forest Plan. Not only is the best option offered preserving the status quo which is totally unacceptable, but options B,C,and D are problematic in so many different ways-- weakening protections and increasing logging. The very latest global climate warming data and albedo affect scientific data suggest that climate change is accelerating far faster than ever imagined and we could be seeing results expected late century starting in the 2030s. Many of us testified on the importance of mature and old growth forest being critical for sequestration; mitigating the loss of biodiversity from climate change; filtering, storing and protecting water; and providing resilience from wildfires. Our voices were ignored.

As a trained ecologist specializing in ethology and also mycology, I spend alot of time in Oregon's federal forests. One can already visually see the effects of climate change on various species which are likely to accelerate and this is no time to roll back habitat protections or ramp up logging when we should be doing the opposite as climate scientists have called for and substantially increase bioreserves. We are totally opposed to weakening protections by increasing the age of protected moist matrix mature trees from 80 to 120 years and that in dry forest to 150 years. This essentially means that forests will never age into protection, especially given the loopholes of allowing logging at Forest Service discretion for "reduced risk or fire" or "restoration". The former is often utilized for unnecessary and even harmful fire management practices that further dry out forests by "opening them up" and allowing in more flammable grasses,etc.

We are totally appalled that the proposals might double logging by setting high board feet targets double that of logging in 2023 and potentially logging 81k acres in moist matrix lands and up to 964 k acres over 15 years of dry forests (almost 1/3!). The plan asserts this won't lessen species protections, but does not include species-specific plan components for either endangered or native species. We know that this logging with additional roads and heavy machinery will have heavy negative impacts.

Although we outright reject alternative D, there is some tribal inclusion language that should be adopted separately to foster more costewardship and comanagement beyond just consultation.

This plan should provide a true option A that increases the protections for our national forests and mature and old growth trees in line with climate science and that should be the path forward.