

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/17/2025 10:57:52 PM

First name: Desiree

Last name: La Maggiore

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the public comment process for the NWFP Amendment.

I am a recreation residence special use permit holder with a cabin on FS land. Under the terms of our permit, my family has occupied our cabin for nearly 55 years and has collectively witnessed the steady decline of a healthy forest and vibrant local communities. Our cabin is within an FS Fuels Reduction Project Area that took 15 years, from initial scoping to a record of decision, for a project estimated to take 20 years to complete.

I have been encouraged by the quick response of the FS to begin project implementation last year. I have become quickly discouraged again to find that key personnel overseeing and managing this project are no longer with the FS due the recent actions of our current administration.

This comment is a plea to newly appointed Secretary of Agriculture, Brooke Rollins, and Forest Service Chief, Tom Schultz, to allow for the completion of the Northwest Forest Plan Amendment process.

I sat through four of the Federal Advisory Committee multi-day meetings online listening and observing a group of hard-working, professional, respectful citizens from all walks of life and competing interests, who volunteered their time to be part of that committee. Their hard work, long hours, dedication, conduct, and approach to producing a proposed amendment was exemplary.

Specific comments include:

-Page ES-7 - "...raising the age threshold for treatments in moist forests in LSR from 80 to 120 years .." I object to raising the threshold. The rationale given in one of the sessions was that the trees were now older than they were when the original plan was written. This logic would deem the inventory a finite rather than growing resource. As each stand reaching 80 years of age, it evolves into a new category of asset and habitat worthy of increased scrutiny of treatments employed. Alternative C supports this level of consideration and manages the inventory for growth rather than extinction.

-Page ES-11 - Fire Resistance and Resilience, "Under Alternative C, the area of fuels and vegetation management near communities would be substantially reduced ..." begs the question of further compromise. Is it possible to manage (vs. removal for timber harvest) a stand of plus 80-year-old trees that fall within the community buffer zone so that wildfire risk is reduced? Is there an opportunity for a more community-driven, nuanced approach?

-Page ES-5 - "This alternative also responds to comments and recommendations to provide additional opportunities for tribal co-stewardship and use." Overall, Tribal inclusion and respect for their knowledge of land management practices is long overdue. That said, for this shift to succeed, these communities, many generationally marginalized by the Federal Government, must be adequately resourced to take on the increased engagement and responsibility.

The proposed alternatives appear to be mixing apples and oranges when it comes to actions related to vegetation management/fuel reduction/timber harvesting and tribal inclusion. There is no clear rationale as to why plan alternative components more favorable to tribal inclusion are tied to plan alternative components that include more aggressive timber harvesting actions. If there is a direction connection, please make it simpler to find or consider breaking out into non-competing alternatives.

Respectfully, Desiree La Maggiore

