

Date submitted (UTC): 4/2/2016 1:34:11 PM

First name: Pete

Last name: Martin

Organization:

Title:

Official Representative/Member Indicator:

Address1: 45678 Eagle Creek Road

Address2:

City: Richland

State: OR

Province/Region:

Zip/Postal Code: 97870

Country: United States

Email: martinandriener@operamail.com

Phone: 541-893-6760

Comments:

Dear friends,

In commenting on the proposed "Blue Mountains Forest Resiliency Project" I'd like first to assert that nature is by its very essence resilient: we only observe in nature that which is viable and that which has survived. That statement may be a tautology, but in our short-term provincial human view we may fail to keep sight of this bigger picture, arguing on the basis that humans have disturbed the dynamic equilibrium of the Forest, that we therefore possess the power and the understanding to make the forest resilient. I think it is reasonable for people to try to "undo" past mistakes and to take corrective action for the purposes of conservation, but it is my impression that more restraint is called for in attempting to impose "desired conditions" upon nature.

The Notice of Intent makes heavy use of the notion of historical Range of Variation. I question the presumed knowledge of the structure and composition of the forest, on a time scale beyond that of present human occupation. I believe the magnitude of the present "climate change" may be underestimated in the context of Earth history, especially with respect to time scale, so aiming for forest conditions that are assumed to be an average of a time period that is very short in Earth history may be foolish.

Part of what we've all benefitted from, and enjoyed about, our National Forests for a hundred years or more has been the abundance of nature in which we have been free to partake and to take what we wanted. Of course we'd all like to carry on, but we are coming up against a wall. People tend to decide what they want to do, and then work out reasons why they should do that. The motive of upholding local economies is a false argument for a proposed action called "Forest Resiliency Project". The falsity of the rationale is revealed in the statement of intention to amend existing conservation guidelines. It is revealed in the description of plans to remove the most economically profitable very large trees (many predating fire suppression) ostensibly to achieve a "desired condition" of open canopy. I'm skeptical of the

Resiliency is to be found first in the Forest, not in our short-sighted models. I suggest that areas burned by recent wildfires be studied to ascertain, without preconception, which trees survived, and how the forest regenerates.

Thanking you for your consideration of my comments,
Pete Martin