

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/25/2020 7:00:00 AM

First name: Caroline

Last name: Skinner

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Please modify the Shasta Agness Project

Dear Shasta Agness Objections,

I support KS Wild. As a decades-long Oregon resident, I am unhappy with your draft decision to log 2,199 acres of Late Successional/Old Growth Reserve Lands (LSR) under the guise of "oak restoration." Anyone who is familiar with the mature/old growth forests such as those adjacent to Oak Flat road can plainly see these forests are no place for unit wide thinning of trees up to 28" in diameter. In this area, no oaks exist on at least 95% of the forested landscape.

I do support the treatment of 1,635 acres of plantations. The NFP clearly states that plantations within LSR designations are the priority for management and not older forests that harbor at-risk wildlife. I agree there are some oak restoration units that would benefit from logging on southern exposures on poor soils in the Shasta Creek watershed (such as unit 72) however, the units along Oak Flat road are clearly in no need of unit wide thinning. I recommend that you drop unit wide commercial thinning in Oak Restoration units 8, 9, 10, 54, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, and 79. Radial treatment around existing oaks >8" DBH would be appropriate in these units. All treatments within a mile of Humboldt marten and Northern Spotted Owl sightings must be dropped since the treatments would likely harm these animals contrary to Northwest Forest Plan (NFP) directives. The Draft Decision fails to demonstrate significant benefit from treatments in pine habitats that would offset possible significant adverse impacts to Humboldt marten, Northern Spotted Owl, or red tree voles.

Mature/old growth forests stands such as this one in oak restoration unit 78 is no place for unit wide thinning of trees up to 28"DBH where there are no oaks to restore. Let's work together to implement real restoration rather than cutting corners and ignoring Forest Plan protections for this LSR. I hope to see this corrected.

Just about everyone supports the idea of restoring forests and watershed health, which is why it is so disappointing when timber planners use the language of restoration to log large, ecologically valuable trees. The proposed Shasta Agness Project in the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest is located within a Forest Reserve which is supposed to be a refuge for old-growth dependent wildlife. Yet, the Forest Service draft decision would log over 2,000 acres under the guise of "oak restoration." Many of the timber sale units are no place for logging trees over two feet in diameter to "restore oaks," especially since no oaks exist on at least 95% of the forest stands! Not OK. Thank you for your concern, and for incorporating my concerns into your project planning effort.

Sincerely,

Ms Caroline Skinner