

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/12/2025 6:53:04 PM

First name: Ellen

Last name: Mendoza

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The Federal government should not cut Mature and Old Growth forests. It is that simple. Those trees, already scarce are, a monument of a past world and should be preserved, for their historical, biological, and ecological significance. In addition, those trees embody tremendous amounts of carbon dioxide we need to keep out of the air. There is no good reason to cut them and we, the citizens of the Earth, and more locally, the Pacific Northwest, treasure them and want to be able to visit them, to bask in amazement that they are so big and harbor so much life. I am an avid hiker and backpacker and visit forests with big trees whenever I can. Anything in the revisions to the NWFP that allow cutting of those trees should be changed.

Forests protect watersheds and provide homes for wildlife, including endangered ones, like the spotted owl, marbled murrelet and salmon species. Of course, these species became endangered because of logging. In order for wildlife to survive, they must have the habitat type they evolved with, and corridors of that habitat in order to disperse. Further, clean water is needed by people and the cheapest, easiest way to get it is through protecting watersheds. It is essential that logging not wreck the water we all depend on. This means not logging around streams.

Why doesn't the government and our leaders care about wildlife? Every parent teaches their children about animals, big and little. Why? Because it is a fundamental piece of our understanding of the world. Every person wants to understand how other creatures live. Every person marvels that creatures can live close to us, or in spite of us. We have altered so much of the landscape that it is crucial now, to make sure we leave room for animals and plants to have enough places to live, to ensure their survival. The government is not endowed with the mission to make rich people and corporations richer. Increasing logging has that primary effect.

I don't know any communities in the Northwest that do not benefit from the living forests around them. Whether it is tourism, or hunting and fishing, or hiking, forests throughout this area draw people to them and that generates income to those communities. Logging provides jobs, but they are dangerous jobs, where workers are 33 times more likely to die from workplace injuries than other jobs. Also the number of people employed in logging decreased from 11,000 in the 1990's to about 4,000 currently. <https://www.opb.org/article/2024/12/06/despite-workplace-hazards-and-industrys-decline-logging-still-beckons-in-parts-of-oregon/> If the Federal government is interested in providing employment, there are better jobs to offer.

The revision of the Forest Plan should create and preserve reserves of mature and old growth forests, and core wildlife areas without roads, of at least 1,000 acres, including riparian areas, and those areas should not be cut.

Fire resistance is also improved by leaving forests to grow, mature and persist. There is no truth to the theory that thinning forests improves fire resistance and it certainly negatively affects wildlife.

It is so sad that Gifford Pinchot, the architect of the Forest Service, wanted to conserve the forests and instead this agency is funded and fueled by an unholy need to kill the lands it is charged with protecting. I have seen no evidence that we don't have enough wood for our needs, yet there is some lie being pushed that we are in a wood crisis. This is exactly the mindset that caused Pinchot to argue for the creation of the Forest Service in the first place. Please please please use science and listen to the public when finalizing this plan. We the public want to conserve these acres, for us to enjoy and marvel at, and for other species that depend on them to live.