

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/5/2025 7:31:26 PM

First name: Ryan

Last name: Stucker

Organization: Will Logging & Construction LLC

Title: Managing member

Comments: I believe ANY changes in the northwest forest plan need to include plans to do MORE treatment of our forests to lessen fire risk. If we do not greatly increase the acreages treated yearly we will be faced with a desolate landscape which has been devastated by out of control forest fires. This will be extremely detrimental to our climate, timber industry, tourism, real estate market, and economy in general. Our timber industry in the northwest is at a critical stage and will fall into further disrepair if we don't get a steady flow of timber which could work hand in hand with treating acreage to be more fire resistant. Please, I cannot over state the dire need for changes in the northwest forest plan to keep our timber industry in remote areas alive. There is already a need for processing plants and mills in central Washington because of the loss of infrastructure. This loss was largely created by a lack of steady wood supply.

Some can make the argument that this is just a process of survival of the fittest. I do not see the extra trucking costs associated with processing plants which are few and far between as being beneficial to anyone, especially the environment. The process of hauling raw logs to a processing facility is the most inefficient method used to move wood products. By having processing plants and mills closer to a concentrated wood basket, the amount of carbon emitted to transport the product is lessened throughout the chain of manufacturing and delivery.

If we make an effort to treat our forests and prevent catastrophic wildfire from being prevalent on the landscape, I believe we can store carbon, lessen emissions from large wildfires, protect our environment, and provide steady living wage jobs for thousands.

Another comment I have is to abolish the east side screen. The practice of not cutting any timber 21"+ is not a win for wildlife, the environment or the taxpayers. Some of these trees should absolutely not get cut, some should. It is a decision which should be made by the local silviculturist, the timber managers assistant and the ranger. Too many special interest groups have had their opinions made into decisions. These decisions should be made by the people who are on the ground seeing the issues of the specific site. Under no condition should a final decision be made by some special interest group from Seattle nor a politician in Washington DC!

Thank you for your time, please take my comments seriously.