Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/27/2022 6:00:00 AM
First name: Henry
Last name: Dykema
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Dear Forest Supervisor Erickson:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Red Lodge Mountain Fuels Project. While I understand the legitimate concern for wildfire fire impacts I feel that it is imperative the we analyse the actual level of risk as apposed to a blanket doomsday scenerio developed by laymen which may or may not be backed up by current fire ecology science. The proposal for this project appears to be justified by a single driver which has not been fully vetted through the appropriate scientific channels. This is a significant timber harvest being performed on a large tract of public land. Why has there not been an EIS analysis of the ecological impacts this treatment will likely cause? Why is the public scoping limited to 30 days? Why hasn't the purpose and need objectives been scientifically evaluated for merit? I am concerned that these projects are rooted in fear and not science. Indeed, if the Forest Service implemented projects to reduce human caused ignition we would potentially reduce the fire risk by up to 90%, a much more effective effort than harvesting trees. I would like to see the proposed treatments be scientifically evaluated for their ecological impacts, including habitat impacts and loss, so the public has an opportunity to evaluate the costs and benefits of this project on their public land in order to make informed comment. Please conduct a detailed review of all possible impacts this treatment may have on this ecosystem and perform an Environmental Impact analysis required by the National Environmental Policy Act. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Henry Dykema