

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/14/2021 1:38:10 PM

First name: Stephen

Last name: Schmidt

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I see a number of problems with the Landscape Resiliency Project. I would hope some of these issues would be addressed by a full EIS. Among my concerns is the plan to do so much drastic thinning which seems to be geared to lumber production in that it initially wanted to take trees with a 24 inch diameter. Reducing that to 16 inches still takes older more fire resistant trees and would leave the smaller diameter and less valuable trees. The amount of thinning would leave the ground open to far too much drying conditions which with our present global warming projections would be far worse for the forest making the remaining trees more susceptible to damage from wind, drought, and disease. Burning the slash piles which I have seen piled up is very un-natural and sterilizes the ground beneath it leaving it sterile and hydrophobic. The damage from the road access to cut and remove these trees would do more harm than good. If there was really a concern about tree density and fire why isn't the proposal focused on dog hair thickets and small diameter trees? Is it because they are not commercially valuable?

The concept of burning every 5-15 years is also ill conceived. If this is meant to be a remedy for preventing crown fires it will not work in a warming climate. It will destroy the understory consistently preventing shrubs and new trees from establishing themselves and affect the wildlife that depend on that habitat. Having controlled burns that often would also mean fires all the time creating smoke all the time since I'm sure those fires would not cover the whole acreage in the proposal but be done in sections every year. If the purpose is to protect houses built into the surrounding forest it should be addressed by enforcing strict codes to fireproof those buildings with 100 foot or more mediation of their surroundings, and fire resistant construction. Looking at Paradise California and seeing building built too close together burning down and yet the trees next to them surviving in some cases indicates the problem was not the fire but the lack of fire preparation in that community.

Not all fires are bad for the forests and they are not uniform in their affects and destruction. Yes, fire suppression for the past 100 years was not healthy for the forests, but this proposal will not solve the problem. It will not stop fires given the projected climate change as it is wind and dry conditions that will cause them to spread. Winds will spread embers miles away over fire lines as we have witnessed lately.

Having lived in the area of the Encino Vista project area for 16 years before moving to Santa Fe, I saw more damage done to the forest by illegal activity by ORV and tree poaching than by fire. To take a forest that is relatively healthy and turn it into a Savanah that has only spindly small diameter trees spaced far apart in an attempt to limit fire will just dry the forest out more and leave it more susceptible to fire. If the remaining trees were large diameter and not so far apart so the fungi community could still function and allow communication between the trees it might be a different story. But this would not be part of this proposal. I therefore hope that a proper EIS be done to consider these issues.