

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/17/2025 11:41:49 PM

First name: Janylyn

Last name: Marks

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

The language of the new Northwest Forest Plan amendment differs significantly from the intent of the 1994 original and the FAC Northwest Forest Plan.

The Amendment's Goal #5 "Providing a predictable supply of timber and non-timber products and other economic opportunities to support the long-term sustainability of communities located proximate to National Forest System lands and economically connected to forest resources" goes significantly beyond the original 1994 intent of "sustainable" timber supply.

I believe to different degrees each of the alternatives B, C and D put economic concerns ahead of sustainability of our limited, irreplaceable forest resource.

Is it the mandate of the Forest Service to economically sustain communities? All over the globe it has been shown that the only way to protect natural resources is to bring communities together to preserve them, to help local and indigenous peoples to work with their resources instead of clearcutting them for short term, non-reversible gain. So little is left to us - does it make sense for us to join in the destruction?

The Forest Plan Amendment's "management" approach flies directly in the face of Climate imperatives to sequester carbon. Cutting down older trees especially in natural forest habitats is equivalent to cutting down the last remaining temperate rain forests in the US. When it has been scientifically proven that mature trees do an amazing job cleaning up our air and environment would we continue to chop them down? Or mechanically "clean them up". Haven't we learned from past human needs to engineer nature that it usually goes counter to what nature needs to sustain itself?

I am actively opposed to Alternative D. Increased fuel and mechanical treatments destroy healthy forests and waterways. Human riparian, water and forest management approaches have not worked well so far. Perhaps the Proforestation approach to leaving our existing forests alone? Is there really any reason to cutdown a healthy federal forest of 80+ year old trees other than to make fast money off a finite resource?

If I had to choose right now it would be Alternative C. Alternative C builds on the intentions of the original 1994 Plan:

1. Conserve mature & old-growth ecosystems
2. Protect riparian areas & water
3. Provide a sustainable supply of timber & non-timber products

In addition, Alternative C:

1. Follows the Federal Advisory Committee recommendations to bring diverse groups to the discussion.
2. Encourages local and indigenous groups to engage in the protection of our forests.

However, to get my vote Alternative C should consider modifications along these lines:

*limited mechanical vegetation management unless community threatened by wildfire

*monitored salvage and infrastructure operations (who decides?)

*Inclusion of further protections for mature "late successional" and Old Growth Forests. Especially in areas of moist forest that are more resistant to wildfires.

I would like to participate in future conversations about the Northwest Plan Amendment #64745

Thank you for your time and consideration, Janylyn Marks

"Douglas fir trees are highly effective at sequestering carbon. A single 50-year-old Douglas fir tree can sequester approximately 17 pounds of carbon annually. On a larger scale, 5 acres of Douglas fir trees can capture 127 tons of carbon each year, effectively offsetting the carbon footprint of over 1,000 people. This makes Douglas fir an essential ally in combating climate change while supporting sustainable forestry practices."

<https://www.treeplantation.com/douglas-fir-tree.html>

<https://www.oregonconservationstrategy.org/strategy-habitat/late-successional-mixed-conifer-forests/>

<https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/about/news-room/press-releases-and-statements/2023/12/19/pew-supports-forest-service-initiative-to-protect-old-growth-forests>

<https://frontiergroup.org/articles/proforestation-what-it-and-why-it-matters/>

<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/forests-and-global-change/articles/10.3389/ffgc.2020.594274/full>

<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/forests-and-global-change/articles/10.3389/ffgc.2019.00027/full>