

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/16/2021 2:02:38 AM

First name: Zeke

Last name: Lunder

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Hazard tree removal should focus on roads with high tactical value for firefighting, prescribed fire, and management of future large wildfires.

No slash should be lopped and scattered along roadways that have an important tactical location for controlling future wildfires or managing wildfires or prescribed burns.

Roads with minimal traffic and low tactical value for firefighting, for example in steep, midslope locations, should be a low priority for hazard tree removal and treated only after roads with a higher tactical value have been.

Some forest roads are a relic of former management priorities, and serve little purpose if future management of the area is not centered around timber production. A triage should be conducted as part of this project to identify these roads. Roads which are no longer needed for timber or forest management activities and which lack tactical value for firefighting should be a low priority in this effort.

Dead end spur roads which do not provide access to future timber or restoration projects should be a low priority for work.

So much have changed since we originally designed our forest roads systems. The Forest Service is unable to maintain their current network of roads to an acceptable level of service. Why expend the effort to clear trees along roads which serve minimal use to management of our future forests/bushlands when you do not have the capacity to maintain your current roads at an adequate level of service? The economics of salvage and current market conditions mean that much of the material removed in this effort will not be sold or brought to market. So why is there a rush to get this work done? Why not conduct a more comprehensive assessment to right-size the Forest Service's road system to new timber and land management realities, and then do the work needed to make this system safe?

Taking a more comprehensive/integrated look at the future transportation needs for our forests would allow the Forest Service to lay out hazard tree removal projects which could simultaneously put old roads to bed or convert them to trails, and create control lines for restoration burns in our fire-impacted forests, minimizing duplicate efforts, and reducing long-term soil and watershed impacts.

Will private timberland owners be required to contribute toward the cost of doing hazard tree removal on shared-cost roads?

