

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/17/2025 12:53:42 AM

First name: Alison

Last name: Mortensen-Hayes

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I can see the value of amending the 1994 NWFP. This should serve as an opportunity to strengthen protections for our forests and commitments to biodiversity and healthy environments. It also provides an opportunity for indigenous community involvement, which should not be constricted to fit into any propose alternative. However, any proposed amendment that focuses on capital gain from logging is deeply concerning. Economic gain from timber production should be the very bottom of the list of concerns for the NWFP to address, if at all. The spirit of the original plan is about continuing preservation of our forests, and any amendment to the plan should focus on that bottom line.

Over the past few centuries in the U.S., millions of acres of forests have disappeared to make way for human settlement. We cannot gain those back, and must not allow this to happen any further! What takes 100 years to grow can be destroyed in relative minutes, so we must tread lightly. Again, any increase in logging for economic gain is antithetical to the purpose of forest conservancy, which is the reason for having a forest management plan in the first place. Even logging for the reduction of wildfire risk should be considered carefully as, though I am not a climate scientist, I understand that logging can sometimes increase risk of wildfire.

With all of this said, I have concerns about alternative B due to the expansion of logging from 80 to 120-150 year stands, and I think alternative D should be rejected from consideration.

The US Forest Service should not have to be persuaded on the benefits forests give to our communities. Forests are tied to our lifelines and deserve protection at all costs.