

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/19/2020 5:13:53 AM

First name: Fred

Last name: Runkel

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I live on Twisp River Rd. and care deeply about the health of the watershed I live within. The proposed Twisp Restoration Plan is of such a gigantic scale that it will obviously have a large effect on the quality of life of residents like myself for many years, as well as that of future generations who inhabit our watershed, both human and non-human. It contains several items that cause me concern, things I think it is important to modify.

Why is developing ATV trails even part of a forest restoration plan at all?

One of the main documented effects of ATV trails is the effect on soils and, as a result, water quality. ATV traffic has been shown to compact soils, increasing runoff and eventually reducing water quality in streams that receive the runoff. In the burned areas of forests, isn't this type of problem something that the fires have exacerbated?

Why would we want to add to the problem by inviting ATV use? Also, the noise and nuisance factor that accompanies ATV use is not something I want to see added to the upper Twisp River environment. Why add additional stressors to the remaining wildlife populations following the stress of the fires. Please do not include ATV road construction in this proposal, or set aside existing roads for ATV use.

Another red flag I see in this restoration plan is the inclusion of salvage logging in roadless areas. With such minuscule amounts of forest remaining without roads, can't we restrict salvage logging to unloaded areas, especially since there seems to be significant disputes concerning the effectiveness of this in reducing risks of large fires.

The Forest Service outlined its restoration vision in its 2012 Restoration Strategy and in those guidelines cutting trees larger than 20" diameter was discouraged. The Twisp plan allows cutting up to 30" diameter trees. Unless that is absolutely vital to the success of fire risk reduction, can't we honor the original guidelines and not cut the larger trees?

Overall, I want to see more adherence to the original restoration guidelines with more emphasis on habitat improvement and protecting the status of unroaded areas.

There is so much proposed here and on such a huge scale and often employing what seems to be somewhat controversial methods that I think rather than a one-time approval, the whole thing should be divided into smaller projects and allow for more public education, monitoring, adding new data as it becomes available as projects move ahead and allowing for repeated public input.

Thank you for your consideration of these items.