

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/14/2020 12:02:04 AM

First name: Brianna

Last name: Hartzell

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I was surprised and disheartened to see this proposal; it's a radical departure from the USFS's management strategies from what I've experienced in northern WA. This proposal, which is ~50/50 clear cutting and heavy "thinning" will scan large swaths of a watershed's headwater zone, halt the recreation within the area (a significant stakeholder of the local economy) and create a lasting ecological impact that future generations will have to manage for. It has become clear, over the preceding century, that commercial clear-cut logging has absolutely no place in a fire-cycle ecosystem. Regrowth is chronically under/mis-managed, and lacking oversight, rife with invasive species, dog-hair stands, and ladder fuels. The cost of fire management doesn't fall on the corporations which profit from timber harvest, but the taxpayers, the American people and the working class. As does the lion's share of the remediation costs following large scale logging, which accrue over time, in landscapes fundamentally altered for profit, and rebuilt on the backs and out of the back pockets of everyday citizens.

I ask that an extensive environmental impact study be conducted, that the place, the impact, and the scale be altered, and that the citizens, the local population not bear the burden, visually, or financially of this sale. I do recognize that timber is an important industry, but we both know that it can be done better; is being done better, in so much of our landscape already today.

Kind regards,

Brianna Hartzell