

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/17/2025 6:11:06 PM

First name: Jed

Last name: Irvine

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear USFS staff and stakeholders,

I appreciate the immense amount of work that went into this plan and the process of involving as many stakeholders as possible. I also understand that not doing enough thinning over the decades positioned us for catastrophic fires. It's important to remember, though, that this regional issue significantly plays into the global problem of the loss of too much carbon sequestering biomass. So I'm chiming in on behalf of the millions of stakeholders that can't speak for themselves - the people 50 years from now that are living in a climate-destabilized world.

How much thinning to allow should be revised periodically by an understanding of how much is being lost globally. For example, if we lose another 2% of the Amazon rainforest, shouldn't we reduce thinning our Oregon forests? The global situation needs to be factored in, and adjusted for.

Also, I believe we need to save more young trees than the current amendment will wind up doing, perhaps by setting limits on the amount that is logged in aggregate. These young trees could then continue their life-journey of becoming old growth someday, when they are needed even more desperately than today. If an aggregate limit were set, then within that limit, community safety and economics could be used to prioritize thinning.