

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/21/2021 3:22:56 AM

First name: laura

Last name: ouellette

Organization:

Title:

Comments: [External Email]QMS Project

[External Email]

If this message comes from an unexpected sender or references a vague/unexpected topic;

Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

Please send any concerns or suspicious messages to: Spam.Abuse@usda.gov

Dear Joan,

Thank you for the work that you do to help to address public concerns regarding the management of our national forests. I hear that you are finally able to accept information from concerned citizens. Please consider the following.

I have visited parcels in the QMS project and am concerned about the scheduled harvest and disruption of beautiful, irreplaceable sections of public forest. We have endured progressive loss of our wildlands, habitat, ecosystems, and watersheds. I have been dismayed to observe the effects of old harvest strategies, designed to maximize profit, with too little regard to the long term effects on the land and resources we all share.

Specifically, on June 28th, 2021, my colleagues and I walked parts of unit 243. We measured 5 trees with a DBH of 40-46 inches. There was a creek running through the middle of the unit, with associated riparian ecology. We noted a mixture of tree species and ages, that would make the unit seem more appropriate for late successional reserve than for harvest.

On 8/25/21 we visited unit 273, noting large trees near a stream. The slope was very steep, approximately 60 degrees, such that harvest would be likely to destabilize soil, and promote erosion.

Unit 275 also had large trees and riparian areas. The size of the buffer adjacent to the riparian area seemed inadequate.

Unit 266 had large, mature trees at the southern edge.

Unit 263 was adjacent to a private clear cut, and logging that area would promote further erosion, and habitat loss.

From what I can gather, much of the QMS site had been clear cut at one time. Some of the areas have been overplanted, with a tree density of 300 trees/acre. These trees need to be thinned, but it must be done in a judicious manner, causing the least disruption to the remaining trees and habitat.

It seems that in this era of global warming, and extreme wildfires, we are at risk of losing what little we retain of our forests. I believe that we need to work together to protect this resource for carbon sequestration, watershed protection, wildlife habitat, and for the quality of all of our lives. Thank you for your consideration.

Laura Ouellette