

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/20/2022 8:51:59 PM

First name: James

Last name: Roden

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I feel it is very important to deal with danger trees promptly. There are folks in the preservationist community that say snags are like ecological gold and should be retained everywhere, even along roads. They are wrong. In this landscape there are millions of snags - more than enough to provide habitat away from roadsides. There are also those that advocate that roads are evil and all or most of them should be decommissioned or closed. This landscape is a place where roads and public access are appropriate. Maintaining those roads so that the public can safely use them is not only appropriate but essential to the Forest's mission. Not only are roads essential for public access, but they are needed for sustainable active management of this landscape as it recovers from the fires. I have personal experience with danger trees - just last week I was cross country skiing on a designated and groomed ski trail on the Deschutes Forest (a route on a road that is open to the public in the summer). About 30 seconds after I went by, a dead lodgepole pine fell across the trail with sufficient force to have killed a skier. I consider myself lucky, but that danger tree should have been felled before. Back to the Mt. Hood - there are so many danger trees that the Forest should make many of them available for use as fish logs. I understand that there are many streams outside the fires that are in need of logs for structure and diversity, both on and off the Forest. There are likely to be hundreds of thousands of suitable danger trees that are not viable as a timber product that could be moved and used elsewhere. I imagine the collaborative group would want to help with the prioritization and distribution of logs off Forest. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Keep up the good work.